THE
JAMES SPRUNT STUDIES
IN HISTORY
AND POLITICAL SCIENCE

Published under the Direction of
the Departments of History and Political Science
of the University of North Carolina

✓
C098

VOLUME 40 -42

1958-1960

*

Editors

FLETCHER M. GREEN, CHAIRMAN

WILLIAM WHATLEY PIERSON

KEENER C. FRAZER

J. CARLYLE SITTERSON

JAMES E. KING

F
251
J28
v.40-42

HE JAMES SPRUNT STUDIES IN HISTORY
AND POLITICAL SCIENCE
blished under the Direction of the Departments of History and Political Science
of the University of North Carolina

VOLUME 40

6098

ANDREW JACKSON AND NORTH CAROLINA POLITICS

By

WILLIAM S. HOFFMANN

CHAPEL HILL

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA PRESS
1958

THE JAMES SPRUNT STUDIES IN HISTORY AND POLITICAL SCIENCE

No. 1. Personnel of the Convention of 1861. By John Gilchrist McCormick
Legislation of the Convention of 1861. By Kemp P. Battle. } (Out of print.)

No. 2. The Congressional Career of Nathaniel Macon. By Edwin Mood Wilson. (Out of print.)

No. 3. The Letters of Nathaniel Macon, John Steele, and William Barry Grove, with Notes. By Kemp P. Battle.

No. 4. Letters and Documents Relating to the Early History of the Lower Cape Fear, with Introduction and Notes. By Kemp P. Battle. (Out of print.)

No. 5. Minutes of the Kehukey Association, with Introduction and Notes. By Kemp P. Battle. (Out of print.)

No. 6. Diary of a Geological Tour by Elisha Mitchell in 1827 and 1828, with Introduction and Notes. By Kemp P. Battle.

No. 7. William Richardson Davie: A Memoir. By J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton.
Letters of William Richardson Davie, with Notes. By Kemp P. Battle.

No. 8. The Provincial Council and Committees of Safety in North Carolina. By Bessie Lewis Whitaker.

Vol. 9, No. 1. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in the Province of North Carolina. By D. D. Oliver.
Correspondence of John Rust Eaton. Edited by J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton.

Vol. 9, No. 2. Federalism in North Carolina. By Henry M. Wagstaff.
Letters of William Barry Grove. Edited by Henry M. Wagstaff.

Vol. 10, No. 1. Benjamin Sherwood Hedrick. By J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton.

Vol. 10, No. 2. Bartlett Yancey. By George A. Anderson.
The Political and Professional Career of Bartlett Yancey. By J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton.
Letters to Bartlett Yancey.

Vol. 11, No. 1. County Government in Colonial North Carolina. By W. C. Guess.

Vol. 11, No. 2. The North Carolina Constitution of 1776, and Its Makers. By Frank Nash.
The German Settlers of Lincoln County and Western North Carolina. By Joseph R. Nixon.

Vol. 12, No. 1. The Governor, Council, and Assembly in Royal North Carolina. By C. S. Cooke.
Land Tenure in Proprietary North Carolina. By L. N. Morgan.

Vol. 12, No. 2. The North Carolina Indians. By James Hall Rand.

Vol. 13, No. 1. The Granville District. By E. Merton Coulter.
The North Carolina Colonial Bar. By E. H. Alderman.

Vol. 13, No. 2. The Harrington Letters. Edited by Henry M. Wagstaff.

Vol. 14, No. 1. The Harris Letters. Edited by Henry M. Wagstaff.

Vol. 14, No. 2. Some Colonial History of Beaufort County. By Francis H. Cooper.

Vol. 15, Nos. 1 and 2. Party Politics in North Carolina, 1835-1860. By J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton.

Vol. 16, No. 1. A Colonial History of Rowan County, North Carolina. By S. J. Ervin. (Out of print.)

Vol. 16, No. 2. The Diary of Bartlett Yancey Malone. Edited by Wm. Whatley Pierson, Jr.
The Provincial Agents of North Carolina. By Samuel James Ervin, Jr.

Vol. 17, No. 1. The Free Negro in North Carolina. By Rosser Howard Taylor.
Some Colonial History of Craven County, North Carolina. By Francis H. Cooper.

Vol. 17, No. 2. Journal of a Tour of North Carolina by William Attmore, 1787. Edited by Lida Tunstall Rodman.

Vol. 18, Nos. 1 and 2. Slaveholding in North Carolina: An Economic View. By Rosser Howard Taylor.

Vol. 19, No. 1. Present Status of Modern European History in the United States. By Chester Penn Higby.

(Continued inside back cover)

ANDREW JACKSON AND NORTH CAROLINA POLITICS

By

WILLIAM S. HOFFMANN

Appalachian State Teachers College

CHAPEL HILL

*

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA PRESS

1958

Copyright, 1958, by
THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA PRESS

Printed in the United States of America
The Seeman Printery, Inc.
Durham, N. C.

PREFACE

The most colorful person in all United States history is Andrew Jackson. "Old Hickory's" leading enemies were also dramatic figures, and too many of the histories of the era center around the fascinating personal clashes of Jackson against Calhoun, Clay, Webster, and Biddle. Yet to understand this vitally important period in America's development we must look further than the center of the stage where the leading players performed. We must try to examine segments of the picture and find out how people acted in each of the states that made up the Union. Only after thorough state studies have been made will it be possible to piece together the many complex developments and solve the puzzle of the history of the age of Jackson. This study attempts to examine North Carolina politics from 1824 to 1837 as it affected American history.

Many people have aided me in this work. I am highly honored that the Sprunt Publication Committee selected this manuscript for publication. I greatly appreciate the aid and encouragement given me by colleagues and students at Appalachian. The librarians and other officials of the State Department of Archives and History, the state library, and the libraries of the universities of North Carolina, Duke, and Wisconsin have my sincere thanks for the courtesies that they extended me. To the late Dr. A. R. Newsome, Dr. Clement Eaton, and Dr. William B. Hesseltine I owe much for the inspiration and training that they gave me. I am deeply indebted to Dr. Hugh T. Lefler and Dr. J. C. Sitterson for helping me in my work, reading my manuscript, and making many valuable suggestions. Words cannot express my appreciation to Dr. Fletcher M. Green, who directed my graduate study and who in hundreds of ways aided me in my research and writing. Most of all I want to acknowledge my gratitude and devotion to Gloria, my wife, without whose aid this book could not have been written.

205399

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/james-sprunt-studies-history_1958_40

CONTENTS

PREFACE v

CHAPTER

I. THE HERO OF THE NATION 1

II. THE CRAWFORD MEN BECOME JACKSONIANS 6

III. THE ELECTION OF 1828 16

IV. THE SPAIGHT FACTION AND THE ELECTION OF SENATORS 26

V. THE DISMISSAL OF JOHN BRANCH AND ITS POLITICAL REPERCUSSIONS IN NORTH CAROLINA 37

VI. THE THREE PARTIES AND THE ELECTION OF 1832 47

VII. NORTH CAROLINA POLITICIANS IN THE NATIONAL CRISIS OF 1833 58

VIII. THE TWO-PARTY SYSTEM AND THE DOUBLE-EDGED SWORD CALLED INSTRUCTIONS 69

IX. PARTISANISM BRINGS VICTORY TO THE WEST 81

X. DEMOCRATS ON THE DEFENSIVE: THE GREAT DEBATE OVER LAND POLICY 90

XI. THE GREAT CRUSADE FOR AN UNPOPULAR CANDIDATE 102

XII. EVALUATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS 115

BIBLIOGRAPHY 123

INDEX 129

ANDREW JACKSON AND NORTH CAROLINA POLITICS

CHAPTER I

THE HERO OF THE NATION

"Demagogues have used the name of General Jackson as a passport to political promotion."

James Graham[1]

"The object of the Jackson party is . . . to get possession of the State Government."

Lewis Williams[2]

Muskets roared. Cannon balls tore gaping holes in the advancing red line. The British redcoats stopped their advance toward the city. The Battle of New Orleans was won, and the skinny Tennessee general who had successfully conducted the defense became the great hero of the nation.

By his great victory, Andrew Jackson had done more than save a city. Unknown to Jackson and the brave defenders of New Orleans politicians had already signed the Treaty of Ghent ending the War of 1812, but the victory gave Americans great reason to be thankful. Three years of war had gone by without a first class military victory and with many humiliating reverses. In spite of the years of defeat and the signing of a peace treaty conspicuously omitting mention of the grievances that caused the war, New Orleans boosted the Americans' self respect. Andrew Jackson had defeated the conquerors of Napoleon! Sitting on cracker barrels around country stores the people could boast of how they had licked the redcoats.

The great victory, perhaps the most one-sided in all American military annals, made the Victor of New Orleans more than a man of military fame. Biographers of the hero attributed to him all the virtues and ideals that Americans held dear. Jackson was a self-made man, close to nature, a man of correct instinct rather than a product of pompous education or foreign travel. According to the biographies of the 1820's Andrew Jackson was a simple farmer, a man of the land. According to the legend he was the Cincinnatus, who put down his

[1] James Graham to William A. Graham, Rutherfordton, August 27, 1825, William Alexander Graham Papers, Department of Archives and History, Raleigh. Hereinafter cited W. A. Graham Papers, Raleigh.

[2] Lewis Williams to Bartlett Yancey, April 4, 1925, Edwin M. Wilson, *The Congressional Career of Nathaniel Macon Followed By Letters of Mr. Macon and Willie P. Mangum with Notes by Kemp P. Battle, The James Sprunt Historical Monographs* (Chapel Hill) II, No. 2 (1900), 52. Hereinafter cited Wilson, "Letters of Macon and Others."

plow to save the country, then longed for nothing but to retire again to his soil. Jackson was favored by God, yet was a man capable of creating his own destiny. The myth makers insisted that Jackson was not a politician. He had refused to run for president in 1816, but he was willing to serve his country if called. Andrew Jackson was the one man whom the people loved to honor.[3]

Before Jackson's candidacy was before the country, people were more concerned with state than with national politics. Politics was personal, rather than partisan. The death of the Federalist party had ended the semi-unity that a two party system brings to American politics, and what remained was a mad unorganized scramble for the offices of the state and country. Personalities, not issues, dominated political life. The great majority of people were indifferent to politics, and those who were concerned put their chief interest in the state.

To the people of North Carolina in the 1820's "our country" meant the state. Governor Hutchins G. Burton urged the legislators to exert themselves to improve "our common country," and everyone understood that Burton was referring to the state of North Carolina and not to the United States of America.[4] Burton's successor, James Iredell, Jr., also spoke of the state as "our country," and praised the people for the "high degree of harmony and mutual good feeling" that prevailed.[5] Before beginning the major part of his address, which concerned the needs of the state, Iredell discussed the state and the government of the United States. The governor explained in hackneyed phrases that North Carolina had not surrendered its sovereignty when it accepted the United States government as an agent for itself and its sister states. He admitted that the people of the state were obligated to pay taxes to the central government to provide for the common defense, but he emphasized that the states had granted the federal government only limited powers. Iredell was not unique in his observations; he was repeating the beliefs of the majority of the people of the state.

When Andrew Jackson became the presidential candidate of the masses, the people devoted more interest to national politics. North Carolinians, like the people of the rest of the nation, greatly admired Andrew Jackson. Every year at July 4 celebrations and other festive occasions toasts were offered to "Old Hickory," as Jackson was fondly called. By the early 1820's Jackson had emerged as a folk hero, an embodied myth, upon whom hungry hundreds of politicians wished to capitalize.

The first politicians to support Jackson were those who were out of power. After Jackson's friends in Tennessee placed the hero's

[3] John William Ward, *Andrew Jackson: Symbol of an Age* (New York, 1955), 31, 43, 52.
[4] Charlotte *Catawba Journal*, December 4, 1827.
[5] Tarboro *Free Press*, November 28, 1828.

name in nomination, he was not lacking for champions in North Carolina. His two chief leaders in the state were William Polk and Archibald Murphey. Polk was a wealthy banker and land speculator and a former Federalist. Politically speaking, Polk had been rather inactive since the death of the Federalist party, but was now seeking a political comeback. Murphey had once been highly respected, but in 1824 he was facing bankruptcy, deeply in debt to many of his friends, and generally discredited.

In early 1824 Jackson's strength began to grow. His military reputation caused the "more common and illiterate class of the community" to prefer him to other candidates, and opportunists took up Jackson's cause.[6] To gain popularity Senator John Branch deserted William H. Crawford and championed the Hero of New Orleans.[7] Several men urged Polk to form an electoral ticket, but Branch warned that should a "collision" occur between the friends of Jackson and the supporters of John C. Calhoun, William H. Crawford would carry the state.[8]

William H. Crawford had the support of the state's most popular leaders. This group called themselves "Old Republicans" and rather consistently followed principles that Jefferson had proclaimed about 1798. Nathaniel Macon, the elderly and respected United States senator, was leader of the group nationally, while Bartlett Yancey, an influential leader representing the wealthy tobacco planters of Caswell County, was state leader. Most of the Old Republicans represented the north-central section of the state, the Roanoke Valley or the Tar and the Neuse River regions. These sections were the most prosperous agricultural areas, and the only regions where large slaveholding was common. The Old Republicans were bound together by a similarity of principles. They demanded limited government, strict construction of the federal constitution, and opposed governmental expenditures. Although not the only Republican faction in the state, the Old Republicans were the strongest single group.

A rival Republican group was devoted to John C. Calhoun. Charles Fisher, an influential politician from Salisbury, was the faction's leader. Since the people expected a congressional caucus to nominate Crawford, Fisher and his group tried to discredit the caucus and succeeded in arousing some feeling against it. The Crawford men in the state legislature held a caucus and selected an electoral ticket. The *Western Carolinian,* a Salisbury paper devoted to Fisher, denounced the caucus and urged the formation of a "People's ticket" in opposition to the

[6] Thomas Jefferson Green to William Polk, Warrenton, February 2, 1824, William Polk Papers, Department of Archives and History, Raleigh.

[7] John Branch's Speech, Charlotte *Miners and Farmers Journal,* March 15, 1835; Wendell Edwards' Speech, Tarboro *Free Press,* February 28, 1835.

[8] John D. Hawkins to William Polk, Raleigh, February 14, 1824, John Branch to William Polk, Washington, February 22, 1824, William Polk Papers.

caucus candidate. Revolutionary War hero and avid office seeker Montfort Stokes joined Fisher in the "Peoples party" movement, and they guided public meetings to nominate electors devoted to Calhoun. As late as November, 1823, observers believed that Crawford and Calhoun would be the main contestants for North Carolina's electoral vote.[9]

Calhoun's chances of winning the presidency ended when he failed to gain the Republican nomination from Pennsylvania. After a few weeks of indecision the South Carolinian agreed to become a candidate for vice-president.[10] Most of Calhoun's North Carolina adherents agreed that Jackson should be the presidential candidate and Calhoun the vice-presidential candidate on the People's ticket. Only a few changes were made in the original slate of the People's party electors. What had started out to be the Calhoun party became the Jackson party.

Several thousand North Carolinians favored John Quincy Adams for president. A few of the original Calhoun men preferred him as their second choice, and most of the former Federalists favored Adams over any other candidate. A few spokesmen of the People's party promised to vote for the candidate who had the best chance to defeat Crawford. The Federalists believed that a separate Adams ticket would give the victory to Crawford, so they refused to put a ticket in the field and generally voted for Jackson.[11] Many Quakers also favored Adams but, since Jackson was pictured as a man of violence, most of them either supported Crawford or stayed away from the polls. Many of Adams' supporters wrote the name of their favorite on their ballot. About five thousand North Carolina voters favored Adams, and a majority of them voted for the People's ticket.[12]

Issues as well as personalities played a part in the campaign. The advocates of the Jackson-Calhoun ticket urged the voters to end "Virginia domination," but Federalists had been unsuccessfully shouting this cry since 1800.[13] The supporters of the People's party portrayed Jackson as a second Washington, and they declared that their electoral ticket was selected by the people rather than by politicians in a caucus. The Crawford men urged the people to vote for their candidate because he was the regular Republican nominee and the supporter of low tariff. They denounced Jackson as a supporter of the "American system" and a man of violent temper. Many people considered North Carolina

[9] Albert R. Newsome, *The Presidential Election of 1824 in North Carolina, The James Sprunt Studies in History and Political Science,* XXIII (Chapel Hill, 1939), 46-61, 123-129. Hereinafter cited Newsome, *Election of 1824.*

[10] Philip S. Klein, *Pennsylvania Politics, 1817-1832: A Game Without Rules* (Philadelphia, 1940), 160-168.

[11] John Stanley to William Polk, New Bern, March 16, 1824, William Polk Papers.

[12] Newsome, *Election of 1824,* 143-154, 158-159.

[13] Newsome, *Election of 1824,* 50, 87, 116-118; Delbert H. Gilpatrick, *Jeffersonian Democracy in North Carolina, 1789-1816* (New York, 1930), 69ff.

a doubtful state, and bets were running high on the result of the election in the state.[14]

Some enthusiasm was aroused by the campaign. Yet only about two-thirds of the people who had voted for members of the legislature the previous August came to the polls in November. The People's party electors received 20,415 votes while only 15,621 voters supported Crawford.[15] The Jackson men were jubilant, but throughout the nation no candidate had a majority, so the House of Representatives would have to decide who should become the next president. An observer who had watched the maneuvering of the Jackson men with disgust predicted, "Time will show that many a hungry expectant will gnaw his nails in bitter disappointment about the Ides of March next."[16]

[14] John S. Ellis to William Polk, Washington, November 17, 1824, William Polk Papers.

[15] Newsome, *Election of 1824,* 155-156.

[16] Thomas Ruffin to Bartlett Yancey, December 3, 1824, Hamilton, J. G. de-Roulhac, ed., *The Papers of Thomas Ruffin,* 4 vols. (Raleigh, 1918), I, 327.

II

THE CRAWFORD MEN BECOME JACKSONIANS

"The Old Republicans are in a state of betweenity but I expect will have to holler for 'Old Hickory' however much against the grain."

Hutchins G. Burton[1]

"Not until they could nowhere find safety save under the banner of the hero of New Orleans . . . was this party . . . to enlist . . . . They were generously taken off the wreck of the Crawford boat."

John Branch[2]

In the election of 1824 the military hero had shown the greatest popular strength, and within a year Jackson partisans formed organizations and gained dominance in many of the states. In some states the regular Republican organizations, which had been hitched to William H. Crawford, had received their deathblow, and politicians who belonged to the group looked for opportunities to join the party devoted to Andrew Jackson. In North Carolina the Crawford men did not lose their dominance with the loss of the presidential election, and they showed no unseeming haste to forget their past associations and jump on the bandwagon of the "Hero of New Orleans."

A few days after the national election, the legislature of 1824 convened. The members of the Senate unanimously reelected Bartlett Yancey as their speaker. Joseph and Weston Gales, editors of the leading Crawford paper, the Raleigh *Register,* won reelection as printers to the state.[3] Nathaniel Macon was returned to the United States Senate by a unanimous vote. A contest developed in the election of the governor. The Old Republicans favored Congressman Hutchins G. Burton, who had voted for Crawford in the congressional caucus. Burton defeated Montfort Stokes, an outspoken Jackson supporter.[4] The anti-caucus editors denounced the legislators for supporting Burton and Gales, but the people were little concerned.[5]

Burton, who represented the Halifax district in Congress, resigned

[1] Hutchins G. Burton to Bartlett Yancey, Ramsours Bridge, December 8, 1826, Hutchins G. Burton Papers, Miscellaneous Papers, Department of Archives and History, Raleigh.

[2] Branch's Speech, Charlotte *Miners and Farmers Journal,* March 5, 1835.

[3] Raleigh *Register,* November 9, 1824.

[4] Raleigh *Register,* December 3, 10, 1824.

[5] Charlotte *Catawba Journal,* November 30, 1824; Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* January 4, 1825.

to accept the governorship. A special election was called to fill the vacancy, and George Outlaw and Willis Alston stood as candidates before the people. The House of Representatives still had the duty of selecting a president, and as part of his campaign Outlaw promised to vote for Crawford while Alston announced his support of Jackson. Outlaw received 633 votes and Alston received only 450.[6] Opposition to Crawford was no guarantee of political success.

Outlaw's victory gave the Crawford men nine of North Carolina's thirteen congressmen. Alfred M. Gatlin soon agreed to vote with the majority and only three representatives dissented. Western representatives Henry W. Connor and Robert Vance agreed to vote with their districts for Jackson, and John Culpepper, Federalist congressman from the Fayetteville district, favored Adams.[7] Willie P. Mangum and Romulus M. Saunders led the Crawford men. During the election of 1824, Willie P. Mangum had been on the verge of shifting to Jackson when he was warned that the action would cause him to be regarded as a turncoat. He reaffirmed his support of Crawford and found that even the supporters of the People's party approved.[8]

The Crawford men realized that their leader had little chance. Speaking for the delegation, Mangum declared, "None of Crawford's friends. . . will move unless all move. They will act with perfect harmony and en masse."[9] By January 10 they had heard rumors that Henry Clay would support Adams in exchange for some high office.[10] Mangum received advice to stick with Crawford. He was told: "Your friends will reward your firmness, while your opponents . . . will observe your consistancy . . . . Should Clay persevere in his present career . . . he may consider the death warrant to his future prospect signed."[11] Romulus Saunders had regarded Jackson's election as the worst possible result for the Crawford men, and he now dropped his pessimism. He wrote that Adams' election would be "the most fortunate result for us, because the

[6] Raleigh *Register,* January 14, 1825; Raleigh *Star and North Carolina Gazette,* January 7, 1825. Hereinafter cited as *Star.*

[7] Romulus Saunders to Bartlett Yancey, December 19, 1824, Albert R. Newsome, "Letters of Romulus M. Saunders to Bartlett Yancy, 1821-1828," *North Carolina Historical Review,* VIII (October, 1931), 448. Hereinafter cited Newsome, "Letters of Romulus Saunders."

[8] Willie P. Mangum to Seth Jones, February 11, 1824, David F. Caldwell to Willie P. Mangum, December 4, 1825, Henry T. Shanks, ed., *The Papers of Willie Person Mangum,* 5 vols. (Raleigh, 1950), I, 115, 207. Hereinafter cited *Willie P. Mangum Papers.*

[9] Willie P. Mangum to Bartlett Yancey, December 25, 1824, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* I, 161.

[10] Willie P. Mangum to Duncan Cameron, January 10, 1825, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* I, 173-174.

[11] William Ruffin to Willie P. Mangum, February 1, 1825, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* I, 186.

public clamour of the Jackson men will fall upon Clay's party—and if we remain firm . . . we avoid the odium and profit too."[12]

Saunders did more than hope for Adams' election. He realized that eleven states were ready to give Adams their vote on the first ballot and that the New Englander's success would be determined by the votes of Maryland and New York. In each state one representative who had not made up his mind before the day of the balloting could vote for Adams and bring about his election. Saunders sought out the undecided Maryland representative, Joseph Kent, and pleaded with him to vote for Adams.[13] Kent complied, and New York's undecided representative also voted for Adams. Thanks in part to Saunders' influence, the so-called "corrupt bargain" between Henry Clay and John Quincy Adams appeared to have reached a successful conclusion.

There were many different reactions to Adams' election. Nathaniel Macon believed it had resulted from a corrupt bargain and when Adams appointed Clay Secretary of State, he voted against confirmation.[14] The *Catawba Journal* declared that Adams' election was just and proper, and the *Register* asserted that it preferred Adams to Jackson.[15] The *Star* congratulated readers on the defeat of "that baneful enemy of the people, the caucus," and acknowledged that Adams was its second choice.[16] Even the rabid Jacksonian journal, the *Western Carolinian,* called Adams' victory "a glorious triumph of principle."[17] The original Jackson-Calhoun adherents still regarded the Crawford men as their enemies.

In the congressional elections of August, 1825, some of the partisans of Jackson and Calhoun followed the lead of the *Star* and the *Western Carolinian* and worked to defeat the supporters of Crawford. Six of the congressmen who had voted against Jackson were not returned to Congress. Archibald McNeill replaced John Culpepper, but Culpepper had never supported Crawford and McNeill had refused to take a stand during the election.[18] George Outlaw, who was critically ill, did not stand for reelection, and Willis Alston won the seat without opposition. Anti-caucus sentiment actually aided in defeating four Crawford men. Richard Dobbs Spaight, the leading Old Republican from the region surrounding the Tar and the Neuse Rivers, had supported Crawford both in the caucus and in the election before the House of Representa-

[12] Romulus Saunders to Bartlett Yancey, December 10, 1824, January 18, 1825, Newsome, "Letters of Romulus Saunders," 445, 449-450.

[13] Extract of a letter of Joseph Kent, Henry Clay, *An Address to the Public Containing Certain Testimony in Refutation of the Charges Against Him Made by General Jackson Touching the Last Presidential Election* (Washington, 1827), 60.

[14] Raleigh *Star,* March 18, 1835.

[15] Charlotte *Catawba Journal,* March 1, 8, 1825; Raleigh *Register,* February 15, 1825.

[16] Raleigh *Star,* February 18, 1825.

[17] Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* March 1, 1825.

[18] Newsome, *Election of 1824,* 57, 82.

tives. Several enemies of Spaight sponsored John Heritage Bryan, and because of Bryan's personal popularity, an anti-treating campaign which hurt Spaight, and the anti-caucus sentiment, Bryan won the election.[19] Ex-Governor Gabriel Holmes defeated Charles Hooks; Richard Hines defeated Dr. Thomas Hall; and Lemuel Sawyer replaced Alfred Gatlin. All three victors campaigned in part on an anti-caucus platform. Of the four anti-caucus victors, all except Sawyer became supporters of Adams.[20]

Five Crawford men won reelection, two of them defeating ardent advocates of Jackson. Romulus Saunders and Weldon Edwards had no opposition. Lewis Williams defeated Meshack Franklin, who was also a Crawford man. John W. Long faced strong competition in popular pro-Jackson John Giles, but Long won reelection. In the closest contest of the election, Josiah Crudup, a Wake County Baptist minister, opposed Willie P. Mangum. Crudup was a former congressman and an elector on the People's ticket, but Mangum won the election by a majority of 56 votes. Antipathy to Crawford was not great enough to defeat clever politicians who had supported his cause.[21]

Only one of the two representatives who had voted for Andrew Jackson triumphed in the congressional elections. Henry W. Connor was reelected without opposition, but Robert Vance faced two strong opponents. Samuel Carson, a popular politician of the Davy Crockett type and an extremely ardent Jackson supporter, won the election, and anti-Jackson leader James Graham came second.

Although the Crawford men found that early championship of the "Hero of New Orleans" was not essential to political success, it was difficult for them to remain neutral. Lewis Williams hoped that Crawford would "come out with renewed strength and splendour." He asked Bartlett Yancey to "preserve the organization of the Crawford party" and to urge every man who had attended the state Crawford caucus to hold himself in readiness for Crawford's reemergence as a candidate.[22] Macon wrote that every member of the General Assembly who supported Crawford ought to stand for reelection.[23] Willie P. Mangum declared, "The Crawford men will have to stand aloof . . . from all political considerations having relation to the next presidency—and support or oppose . . . as . . . judgment may dictate."[24]

[19] Raleigh *Register,* August 19, 1825; John Ellis to John H. Bryan, Washington, September 17, 1825, John H. Bryan Collection, Papers, II.

[20] Raleigh *Star,* July 29, 1825; Raleigh *Register,* August 20, 1825.

[21] Charlotte *Catawba Journal,* June 7, August 23, 1825.

[22] Lewis Williams to Bartlett Yancey, April 4, 1825, J. G. deRoulhac Hamilton, ed., "Letters to Bartlett Yancey," *The James Sprunt Historical Publications* (Chapel Hill), X No. 2 (1911), 52.

[23] Nathaniel Macon to Bartlett Yancey, December 26, 1824, Wilson, "Letters to Nathaniel Macon and Others," 73.

[24] Willie P. Mangum to Bartlett Yancey, January 15, 1826, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* I, 231.

Political considerations and southern interests dictated that the Crawford men should oppose John Quincy Adams. In his first annual message Adams approved the national bank, recommended internal improvements, and urged Congress not "to slumber in indolence and . . . proclaim . . . we are palsied by the will of our constituents."[25] To Old Republicans, believing in Jefferson's early principle of strict construction, this was rank heresy, and Macon argued that if Congress had the power to do what Adams recommended, it could free every slave in the land.[26] Governor Burton urged the legislature to instruct the state delegation against the principles which Adams had advocated; and Mangum declared, "The administration will be conducted upon corrupt principles, more corrupt than any that has preceded it."[27] The principles that Adams proclaimed did drive many men into the opposition.

One of the first problems of the national administration was the question of federal authority in the dispute between Georgia and the Creek Indians. Adams upheld the Creeks and state's righters denounced his action. A writer condemning Adams for his stand declared that if the federal government could defend Indian tribes within a state, it could also emancipate slaves.[28]

In early 1826, in Washington, great opposition arose over Adams' decision to send delegates to a conference at Panama. The Old Republicans frequently consulted with Martin Van Buren, the Crawford leader in 1824, who felt that only time was needed to form an opposition party of the followers of Crawford, Jackson, and Calhoun.[29] He selected the Panama Conference as the issue, and all the Crawford men from North Carolina except Lewis Williams and John Long opposed the administration's measure. In the Senate, Macon voted with John Branch and the other Jackson men to embarrass the administration.[30]

During the Panama debates John Branch tried to make himself the leader of the Jacksonians. He introduced a resolution calling Adams a dictator. Supposedly speaking on his resolution, Branch delivered a philippic denouncing the corrupt bargain, the principles of the first message, and abuse of patronage. Adams regarded Branch as "one of the meanest of my persecutors," and Jackson appreciated Branch's work.[31]

[25] James D. Richardson, *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789-1897,* 9 vols. (Washington, 1896), II, 299-317.

[26] Nathaniel Macon to Bartlett Yancey, December 26, 1825, Wilson, "Letters of Nathaniel Macon and Others," 76.

[27] Willie P. Mangum to Bartlett Yancey, January 15, 1826, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* I, 231; Charlotte *Catawba Journal,* January 7, 1825.

[28] "A Slaveholder" in Warrenton *Reporter,* August 16, 1825.

[29] Romulus Saunders to Bartlett Yancey, January 10, 1826, February 1, 1827, Newsome, "Letters of Romulus Saunders," 454, 461; John C. Fitzpatrick, ed., *The Autobiography of Martin Van Buren* (Washington, 1920), 90-93. Hereinafter cited Van Buren, *Autobiography.*

[30] *Register of the Debates in Congress,* 14 vols. (Washington, 1824-1837), II, Part I [Serially numbered 44], 142, 667, 771.

[31] Charles Francis Adams, ed., *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams,* 12 vols. (Phila-

Branch was striving for personal leadership and wrote Jackson to warn him that some of his "would-be leaders," especially those who had espoused the cause of Crawford, were "aspiring politicians."[32] The Old Republicans had no desire to see a future administration dominated by such men as John Branch, and in spite of opposition to Adams' measures they were willing to leave the door open for a possible alliance with the administration.

Realizing that patronage was an important element in politics, Bartlett Yancey urged Mangum to approach Clay and find out if the administration was willing to do "something for our state."[33] Adams wanted to appoint a North Carolinian, William Gaston, as Secretary of War, but Clay and other advisers preferred another, and Gaston did not get the appointment.[34] Ex-Federalist Gaston was not a political friend of the Old Republicans, and his appointment would not have won their support.

The Crawford men were not afraid to solicit office. Before Adams' election was official Weldon Edwards urged him to select Ex-Governor William Miller for the Guatemalan mission, and Adams made the appointment.[35] Miller accepted, but all the Crawford men were not pleased. Macon expressed disgust that such an "inferior station" was the highest position offered to a state leader.[36] Miller died before he arrived at his post, and Hutchins G. Burton and Lewis Williams tried without success to secure the place for destitute friends.[37] The administration found very few jobs for needy politicians of the state.

Clay and Adams did offer an appointment to Bartlett Yancey. They offered him the position of minister to Peru. Yancey intimated that he might accept. Hearing the news and realizing "the offer was intended . . . for the purpose of dividing and conquering those who [had] supported Crawford," Macon wrote Yancey and demanded that he refuse the post.[38] Yancey declined the post and stated that since the position was "intended for the state," it was "unworthy of her dignity and

---

delphia, 1875), VII, 96-99, 128. Hereinafter cited as *Memoirs; Register of the Debates in Congress,* II, Part I [Serially numbered 44], 385-389; Andrew Jackson to John Branch, Hermitage, March 3, 1826, William H. Branch Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

[32] John Branch to Andrew Jackson, December 11, 1827, John S. Bassett, ed., *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson,* 7 vols. (Washington, 1928), 403. Hereinafter cited *Jackson Correspondence.*

[33] Bartlett Yancey to Willie P. Mangum, December 20, 1825, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* I, 214.

[34] Adams, *Memoirs,* VII, 546-547, VIII, 4.

[35] Adams, *Memoirs,* VI, 499.

[36] Nathaniel Macon to Bartlett Yancey, April 16, 1826, Wilson, "Letters of Nathaniel Macon and Others," 88.

[37] Raleigh *Register,* October 21, 1825; Hutchins G. Burton to Willie P. Mangum, November 9, 1825, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* I, 203; Lewis Williams to Bartlett Yancey, November 18, 1826, Hamilton, "Letters to Bartlett Yancey," 61.

[38] Nathaniel Macon to Bartlett Yancey, March 31, 1826, Wilson, "Letters of Nathaniel Macon and Others," 84-85.

honor."[39] The newspapers heard of the offer and it was "whispered about" that Adams had attempted to "bribe the Crawford party," but the "bribe" had been rejected with "utmost indignation."[40]

Yancey's refusal signified that the Crawford men would not ally themselves with the administration; on the other hand, they were not anxious to support Jackson. Macon observed that the groups supporting Jackson and Adams had the same principles: each wanted to make its candidate president.[41] Yancey also felt that there was little choice between the two candidates, and he believed the South would suffer under either one.[42] He suggested that the Old Republicans support DeWitt Clinton or some other northern man who might be able to carry the South.[43] Mangum agreed, but he doubted if Clinton could carry the South.[44] Saunders conferred with Van Buren, and the New Yorker sent special word to Yancey urging him to remain uncommitted so "our late party may act in concert."[45] By April, 1826, the southern Crawford men had decided to "unite to put down Adams, and if they can get no better for the purpose they will take up General Jackson."[46] Saunders believed that Jackson was the only man who could defeat Adams, and he argued that the best his faction could do would be to place Jackson under an "honest cabinet."[47] If the Crawford leader, Martin Van Buren, could dominate the future cabinet, Old Republicans would be in a favored position.

In the spring of 1827 Van Buren made a southern tour. The Old Republicans respected him as the leader of all the forces that opposed increasing federal authority. He stopped in Raleigh for a few days, and this caused much political speculation. The *Western Carolinian* admitted that Van Buren was a Jacksonian but made disparaging remarks about his political management.[48] It devoted additional space to praise of John C. Calhoun. The South Carolinian had tried to win the Crawford men to his banner, but they had noticed his inconsistencies

[39] Priestley H. Mangum to Willie P. Mangum, March 29, 1826, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* I, 263.

[40] Raleigh *Star,* April 21, 1826; Charlotte *Catawba Journal,* May 2, 1826, quoting the Salisbury *Western Carolinian.*

[41] Nathaniel Macon to Bartlett Yancey, April 6, 1826, Wilson, "Letters of Nathaniel Macon and Others," 88.

[42] Bartlett Yancey to Willie P. Mangum, January 25, 1826, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* I, 240-241.

[43] Romulus Saunders to Bartlett Yancey, April 17, 1826, Newsome, "Letters of Romulus Saunders," 457.

[44] Willie P. Mangum to Bartlett Yancey, January 15, 1826, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* I, 233.

[45] Romulus Saunders to Bartlett Yancey, January 10, 1826, Newsome, "Letters of Romulus Saunders," 454.

[46] Willie P. Mangum to Charity Mangum, April 8, 1826, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* I, 268.

[47] Romulus Saunders to Bartlett Yancey, April 7, 1826, Newsome, "Letters of Romulus Saunders," 457.

[48] Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* May 8, 1827.

and believed that he was trying to use them.[49] At about the time of Van Buren's southern tour Calhoun made a special trip to see Bartlett Yancey.[50] The citizens of Caswell County had planned a banquet to honor retiring Representative Romulus M. Saunders, and Calhoun was invited to attend. When asked to propose a toast, Yancey praised "the great Republican state of New York."[51] Even in Calhoun's presence the Old Republicans were making it clear that they belonged to the Van Buren wing of the party.

The main question in national politics was whether to support Jackson or Adams, but it had little bearing on the 1827 congressional elections. The campaigns were largely tests of personal popularity and six Adams supporters were elected. Lewis Williams, a brother of Jackson's long-time Tennessee enemy, John Williams, had become a supporter of the administration. Although the people of the district had given Jackson an overwhelming majority in 1824, they reelected Williams by a large margin. John H. Bryan was reelected without opposition. John Long and Gabriel Holmes easily were returned to Congress despite their alignment with the administration forces. Daniel L. Barringer, a friend of the administration, had won a congressional seat in 1826 when Mangum resigned to accept state office. The following year Barringer was opposed by Archibald D. Murphey, an original Jackson leader, but Barringer won reelection. Ex-Congressman John Culpepper, an Adams man, won back his seat from Archibald McNeill.[52] Support of the administration was no great deterrent to winning office.

Seven Jacksonians won elections. Henry W. Connor and Willis Alston were easily reelected, and Lemuel Sawyer won after a hard contest with Adams partisan William B. Shepard. Jackson-Calhoun elector Augustine H. Shepperd won the seat vacated by Romulus M. Saunders, and Daniel Turner replaced Weldon Edwards, who had voluntarily retired. The only election centering on national politics was in the Tarboro district. Dr. Thomas Hall, an Old Republican leader now supporting Jackson, won back the seat he had lost to Adams partisan Richard Hines. The most bitter race was between two Jackson men, Samuel Carson and Robert Vance. Carson won by a large majority, but during the campaign Vance provoked a quarrel, and after the election the two met at the South Carolina line "for the purpose of drawing off some hot blood which was generated during the campaign."[53] Carson killed Vance in the duel.

[49] Willie P. Mangum to Bartlett Yancey, January 15, 1826, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* I, 234.
[50] Romulus Saunders to Bartlett Yancey, February 12, 1827, Newsome, "Letters of Romulus Saunders," 460-461.
[51] Raleigh *Star,* February 23, 1827.
[52] Raleigh *Register,* August 22, 1827.
[53] William A. Graham to Thomas Ruffin, November 7, 1827, *Thomas Ruffin Papers,* I, 418.

The Old Republicans never completely dominated the state, but during the period between the elections of 1824 and 1828 they remained the most powerful single group. In 1825 the original Jackson men defeated the pro-Adams Joseph Gales for state printer. Every year from 1825 through 1831 the legislature elected the editors of the Raleigh *Star* as state printers. This was the only unified action of the Jackson-Calhoun men; usually when Old Republicans were in agreement among themselves their candidates could win positions.

One exception came in 1827. Having served three terms, Governor Hutchins G. Burton was ineligible for reelection, and the Old Republicans supported Richard Dobbs Spaight to replace him. James Iredell, son of the United States Supreme Court justice and Revolutionary leader, was supported by the Fisher group in the West.[54] William Polk, the original Jackson leader, was also in the race and had the support of John Branch.[55] On the second ballot Spaight and Iredell were even; after Polk's name was withdrawn Iredell won the position.[56] The alliance of former Federalists with the western Republicans and original Jackson men was too great for Old Republicans to overcome.

In September, 1828 a loss greater than defeat in the gubernatorial election came to the group. Bartlett Yancey died. Yancey was the most powerful politician in the state, and his influence extended beyond his immediate faction. Even original Jackson men such as Samuel Carson and John Branch, wanted to be thought of as Yancey's friends.[57] After Yancey's death leadership of the group fell to Richard Dobbs Spaight, Romulus M. Saunders, and Yancey's successor in the state Senate, Bedford Brown. None were able to equal Yancey in dominating the state legislature for their faction.

The Crawford men had not lost their dominance with the loss of the presidential election of 1824. President John Quincy Adams' messages and measures had violated their principles, and his administration had not offered them enough patronage to win their support. Although they opposed most of the measures of the administration, they did not immediately become supporters of Jackson, and only with great reluctance did they espouse the hero's cause. Yancey had always mistrusted the military hero and supported him only because he considered Adams as a greater evil. The new leaders had less distrust of Jackson.

[54] Frances Iredell to her husband, James Iredell, Raleigh, January 14, 1828, Charles Earl Johnson Collection, Department of Archives and History, Raleigh, North Carolina. Hereinafter cited Johnson Collection.

[55] John Branch to William Polk, [Washington], December 15, 1827, William Polk Papers.

[56] Raleigh *Register,* December 27, 1827.

[57] Hillsboro *Recorder,* September 10, 1828; Hutchins G. Burton to Bartlett Yancey, Ramsours Bridge, December 8, 1826, Hutchins G. Burton Papers; Samuel Carson to Bartlett Yancey, Washington, February 7, 1828, Walter Clark Manuscripts, Department of Archives and History, Raleigh, North Carolina.

Although the members of the Old Republican faction were late to espouse the cause of the hero, they became the strongest wing within the party.

Not only in North Carolina, but in other states as well, the Old Republicans were accepting Andrew Jackson as their leader. Martin Van Buren of New York, always keeping in touch with Crawford's former supporters, led the movement. At about the same time as the North Carolina Old Republicans shifted to Jackson, in other states Crawford's followers were also accepting "Old Hickory" as the Republican standard-bearer. Martin Van Buren had no power to make the North Carolinians or the other Old Republicans follow his lead. They had consulted, and acting independently they decided to support Jackson. The hero's original platform was ambiguous, but John Quincy Adams clearly stood for everything the Old Republicans opposed. The Van Buren wing of the Jackson party was a real successor of Jeffersonian democracy.

CHAPTER III

THE ELECTION OF 1828

"The late Presidential Contest was a race for the offices and patronage of the Republic."

James Manney[1]

"The calumniators of Andrew and Rachel. . . . They deserve to be transported to a Spanish Inquisition and lashed with iron chains."

Toast by a Mr. Miller
at Stantonburg banquet[2]

In North Carolina, as in the country at large, the presidential campaign of 1828 began early. When the 1824 election was before the House of Representatives, the charge of corrupt bargain served as a signal for partisans to choose sides and to defend or to denounce the alliance of John Quincy Adams and Henry Clay. In North Carolina personal politics and the fight against the Crawford men continued, but editors filled their columns with charges against the administration or its enemies. At public banquets citizens gave toasts denouncing or praising national leaders, and politicians speculated on the outcome of the next presidential race. Yet the great majority of the people felt little concern over the election, and it was not until the autumn of 1827 that the campaign began in earnest.

While most of the Republicans were deciding to support Jackson, the ex-Federalists were dividing about equally between the two candidates. Many of the administration supporters were ex-Federalists or men who were Federalist in feeling. William B. Shepard declared, "The friends of Mr. Adams . . . generally compose the better class of society."[3] Daniel Webster wrote ex-Federalist leader William Gaston of the "tendency in Mr. Adams to stand well with the Federalists," and Gaston expressed his friendship for the administration.[4] Former Federalists William B. Meares, John Culpepper, Thomas P. Devereaux, William Davidson, and James Brownrigg were leaders in directing

[1] New Bern *Spectator*, July 26, 1829, quoting James Manney to Raleigh *Star*.
[2] Tarboro *Free Press*, December 22, 1827.
[3] William B. Shepard to John H. Bryan, Elizabeth City, December 21, 1827, John H. Bryan Papers, II.
[4] Daniel Webster to William Gaston, Boston, May 3, 31, 1826, William Gaston Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Adams' 1828 campaign. The Federalists were the largest element in the administration party.

Although in 1828 a large number of ex-Federalists were supporters of John Quincy Adams, an almost equal number favored Andrew Jackson. William Polk, who first inaugurated the Jackson movement in the state, had been an active Federalist. John Stanley, who in 1824 had been spokesman for many Federalists who supported the People's electoral ticket while stating a preference for Adams, campaigned for Jackson in 1828.[5] Although many of the former Federalists were content to be men without a party, James Iredell and others of the group professed Republicanism, and in 1828 the Iredell group supported Jackson as the Republican candidate.[6] As did many Republicans, a large number of the ex-Federalists supported Jackson because they believed it was the politically expedient course. Some partisans of Adams called Jackson men Federalists, and the Jackson partisans hurled the same charge at the supporters of the administration.[7] Although in the election of 1828 almost half of the known ex-Federalists supported the military hero, they were the least stable element in the Jackson party. With the exception of William Polk, the ex-Federalist exerted little influence in the Jackson organization, but among the Adams partisans they constituted much of the leadership.

In addition to the ex-Federalists, a few Old Republicans, including Lewis Williams and Joseph Gales, contributed leadership to the Adams movement, and others, including John Long, quietly supported it. Enemies of the Old Republicans, including editors Lemuel Bingham and John I. Pasteur, belonged to the Adams group. Their papers constantly reminded readers that Crawford men controlled Virginia, and they begged North Carolinians not to be "humble imitators of the ancient Dominion."[8] There was a strong Quaker element in the party, and Adams' greatest popular support came from the Quaker counties of Guilford and Randolph.[9] Some men supported Adams as the lesser of two evils.[10] The administration party was open to persons of all views.

In the summer of 1827 the Raleigh *Register* began to heap praise on Adams. Inspired letters from its readers complimented Adams and called for a state meeting of administration supporters.[11] Citizens of

[5] John Stanley to William Polk, New Bern, March 16, 1824, William Polk Papers; Report of the New Bern Jackson Meeting, Fayetteville, *North Carolina Journal,* December 12, 1827.

[6] James Iredell to Willie P. Mangum, February 4, 1832, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* I, 473.

[7] New Bern *Spectator,* October 25, 1828; Tarboro *Free Press,* October 3, 1828.

[8] Charlotte *Catawba Journal,* January 2, 1827; New Bern *Spectator,* August 9, 1828.

[9] Salisbury *Yadkin and Catawba Journal,* December 9, 1828.

[10] John Bryan to Bartlett Yancey, January 17, 1827, Hamilton, "Letters to Bartlett Yancey," 60.

[11] Raleigh *Register,* June 1, 5, July 3, 1827.

Carteret County called the first Adams meeting and asked all freemen opposed to the "military candidate" to meet in Beaufort on November 17. They proposed that a state convention select Adams electors, and they chose delegates to represent their county.[12] In the following weeks Adams men in many other counties held similar meetings, passed resolutions, published addresses, and selected delegates to the state convention.

Lewis Williams hoped that most of the voters who had supported Crawford in 1824 would vote for Adams. He believed this could be accomplished if Crawford were named as the vice-presidential candidate on the administration ticket. Adams never countenanced the project, but Williams was reluctant to give it up.[13] The night before the state-wide administration convention met, a group of leaders held a caucus, and some of them advocated Williams' plan. Gaston opposed the plan, and the leaders agreed to make no vice-presidential nomination.[14] They decided to allow the central committee to name the vice-presidential candidate, and later in the campaign the committee followed the lead of other states and added Richard Rush to the ticket.[15]

On December 20, 1827, at Raleigh the state convention assembled. The delegates named William Davidson chairman, and William Gaston delivered the keynote address. Joseph Gales read a list of nominations for electors which received unanimous approval. Gaston wrote an address, and the convention ordered ten thousand copies printed. The delegates selected a Central Committee headed by Joseph Gales and Thomas P. Devereaux.[16] The administration press portrayed the convention as a popular movement of the people, but the *Star* commented that only fifty-five men were present, and it was "kind and considerate of the few friends of Mr. Adams to burn a little incense under his nose, in the midst of his decaying fortunes."[17]

The Jackson men might heap derision on the "few friends of Mr. Adams," but they also needed to perfect an organization. They too were an unharmonious group divided on all questions except who should be the next president. The Jackson-Calhoun men demanded a ticket that retained the South Carolinian, but the Old Republicans wished to see Calhoun dropped.[18] A rumor that Jackson men would caucus and nominate either Van Buren or DeWitt Clinton drove the editors of the *Star* into a frenzy, and the *Western Carolinian* showed similar fury when speculation on Van Buren's southern tour caused fear that the New

[12] Raleigh *Register*, November 13, 1827.
[13] Adams, *Memoirs*, VII, 391.
[14] Edward E. Graham to John H. Bryan, New Bern, January 2, 1828, William Gaston Papers.
[15] Raleigh *Register*, April 11, 1828.
[16] Raleigh *Register*, December 25, 1827.
[17] Raleigh *Star*, January 3, 1828.
[18] Romulus Saunders to Bartlett Yancey, January 20, 1827, Hamilton, "Letters to Bartlett Yancey," 62-63.

Yorker was trying to eliminate Calhoun.[19] William H. Crawford wanted Nathaniel Macon to be the vice-presidential candidate, but DeWitt Clinton was the choice of Van Buren and most of Crawford's former supporters.[20] Before the state's Jackson men selected electors, Clinton died. Martin Van Buren made it clear that he was not a candidate, and the Old Republicans reluctantly accepted Calhoun as Jackson's running mate.

At the time of the state Adams meeting the Jackson men had made no nomination. In December, 1826, Jackson's campaign manager, John Henry Eaton, had written William Polk suggesting that if Jackson had a clear majority the legislature should nominate him.[21] Polk was unable to carry out the plan, and the legislators made no nomination. In April, 1827, Jackson partisans in Franklin County had called a meeting, but they inaugurated no state action.[22] On November 24, 1827, Jackson partisans called a meeting at New Bern and instructed a committee of correspondence to cooperate with others in forming an electoral ticket. A little more than a week later a mammoth Jackson meeting was held at Fayetteville. A committee selected by people who attended the meeting published an address stating their objections to Adams because he had "lived among kings and nobles amidst the splendor and intrigues of foreign courts and had no sympathies for a plain Republican people." The report repeated the corrupt bargain charge and denounced Adams for maintaining the "odious and monarchical doctrine that the *few* govern the many."[23] The people at the meeting passed a resolution instructing their legislators to assist in forming an electoral ticket. Similar meetings followed in other communities.[24]

On December 24, 1827, some pro-Jackson legislators and others assembled at Raleigh in a meeting that had statewide significance. Chief Justice John Taylor presided and George Badger drew up a report. The meeting elected a state central committee headed by William Polk and passed resolutions urging the election of Jackson and Calhoun. The members urged each county to select delegates to district conventions which would choose Jackson electors.[25]

Actually, a group of leaders got together and selected an electoral ticket. Alexander Lawrence, editor of the *Star,* published the list on January 10, 1828. The Raleigh *Register* declared that the electoral

[19] Raleigh *Star,* March 30, 1827; Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* May 8, 1827.

[20] William H. Crawford to Martin Van Buren, Woodlawn, Georgia, December 21, 1827, "North Carolina Letters from the Martin Van Buren Papers," Department of Archives and History, Raleigh.

[21] John Henry Eaton to William Polk, Washington, December 19, 1826, William Polk Papers.

[22] Raleigh *Star,* May 3, 1827.

[23] Addresses of New Bern and Fayetteville Meetings, Fayetteville *North Carolina Journal,* December 12, 1827.

[24] Raleigh *Star,* December 20, 27, 1827.

[25] Raleigh *Star,* January 3, 1828.

ticket had been selected by a secret caucus. The *Register* embarrassed Lawrence by calling attention to the fact that he published results of meetings before the meetings were held.[26] Lawrence explained that the list merely suggested who might best represent the ticket in each district and in no way prohibited the people from choosing whomsoever they pleased. He retaliated by calling the Adams convention a caucus.[27] Jackson men did hold county meetings and select delegates to name electors, but in midsummer when the completed ticket appeared it contained only one man who had not been named on the *Star*'s January list. Throughout the campaign both parties declared their opponent's ticket had been formed by a caucus.

The campaign consisted primarily of a series of charges and countercharges, condemnations and denials. For four years the Jackson men had reiterated the charge that a corrupt bargain had brought the administration to power, and George Howard, editor of the *Free Press,* even printed a "catechism" asserting that Adams' election had violated the constitution.[28] The Adams press denied that any bargain had been made; Clay's explanation even convinced some voters that the charge was the result of a premeditated conspiracy of the Jacksonians.[29] Editor Lemuel Bingham declared that the only corrupt bargain was the one between the Jacksonians and the Crawford men and asserted that aversion to Clay was due to the fact that he stood as an "impassable barrier to John Calhoun, the would be successor of the General."[30]

The Jackson men accused Adams of abuse of patronage and gross extravagance. In Congress, Romulus M. Saunders proposed an inquiry of government printing, and he charged that Clay gave contracts for publishing the laws to editors who would promise to support the administration.[31] The Adams men countered by charging that Jackson editors supported the hero only because they sought future patronage.[32] The *Star* accused pro-Adams congressmen of abusing the franking privilege by sending an excessive number of political tracts through the mail.[33] Samuel P. Carson was the most effective of Adams' critics. His charge that the president had purchased a billiard table at public expense and his description of the "glorious, splendid and princely furniture of the East room" received wide circulation and did great harm to the administration.[34]

[26] Raleigh *Star,* January 10, 1828; Raleigh *Register,* January 15, 29, 1828.
[27] Raleigh *Star,* January 24, 31, 1828.
[28] Tarboro *Free Press,* May 3, 1826.
[29] Thomas Olds to Ebenezer Pettigrew Murfreesboro, [North Carolina], August 9, 1827, Pettigrew Papers, Department of Archives and History, Raleigh.
[30] Charlotte *Catawba Journal,* December 27, 1825; Salisbury *Yadkin and Catawba Journal,* June 8, 1828.
[31] Romulus Saunders' Speech, Raleigh *Register,* March 13, 1827.
[32] Salisbury *Yadkin and Catawba Journal,* September 30, 1828.
[33] Raleigh *Star,* April 24, 1828.
[34] Samuel Carson, *Circular. To the Freemen of the Twelfth Congressional*

Jacksonians made political capital of Adams' failure to have the ports of the British West Indies opened to American trade. Many North Carolinians believed that the state would profit greatly by the trade, and resolutions passed at Jackson meetings indicted Adams for his blundering West Indian policy.[35] Administration supporters said that indirect trade was as profitable as direct trade, and they declared that to accept the humiliating concessions demanded by the British would be a violation of national honor.[36]

Each side asserted that its opponent favored high tariff and internal improvements. A writer in the *Star* stated that the only issue of the campaign was whether to continue in office men devoted to the "so called American system."[37] Samuel Carson issued a circular declaring:

> Lordly manufacturers . . . are the only favorite with the government . . . I look for happier days under Andrew Jackson.[38]

Administration defenders either denounced Jackson as a friend of protection or declared the tariff's importance was greatly overemphasized.[39] The *Register* called the Tariff of 1828 "The Jackson tariff," and said that it was passed in spite of "determined opposition" of the Adams men.[40]

Southern Jackson men had voted against amendments in order to force New Englanders to defeat the tariff.[41] During the discussion concerning reducing rates on molasses, Carson and Bryan clashed in a debate that eventually made the rounds of the North Carolina press. Carson declared that the tax on molasses would increase the price of rum and encourage the use of whisky made from Carolina grain. When asked if he wished to protect whisky, Carson answered that he objected to the whole American system but if anything deserved protection it was the health of his constituents. He averred that substituting the use of "good rye whisky" for "mean Yankee rum" would be very beneficial to the people. Bryan denounced Carson as a friend of high tariff.[42] The administration press declared that the failure of the Jack-

District of North Carolina (Washington, May 20, 1828), 3. Hereinafter cited *To the Freemen.* John H. Bryan to William Gaston, Washington, February 3, 1828, William Gaston Papers.

[35] Report of Orange County Jackson Meeting, Hillsboro *Recorder,* October 8, 1828.

[36] Lewis Williams, *To the Citizens of the Thirteenth Congressional District of North Carolina* (Washington, February 21, 1827), 3; John Long, "To the Freemen of the Tenth Congressional District," Hillsboro *Recorder,* June 4, 1828.

[37] Raleigh *Star,* March 6, 1828.

[38] Samuel Carson, *To the Freemen,* 4.

[39] Salisbury *Yadkin and Catawba Journal,* November 18, 1828; New Bern *Spectator,* August 9, 1828.

[40] Raleigh *Register,* May 30, 1828.

[41] Samuel Carson, *To the Freemen,* 4.

[42] Samuel Carson's Speech and extracts from John H. Bryan's Speech, Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* May 6, 1828.

sonians to support reductions would cost the state $50,000 annually.[43]

As far as the Jackson men were concerned, the break of the campaign came when Henry Clay made an absurd speech. Clay declared that if God should find it necessary to "chastise" America, it was preferable for Him to send "War . . . Pestilence . . . [or] Famine" than to allow "military rule, or a blind enthusiasm for mere military renown."[44] The Jackson men interpreted this to mean that Clay was asking God to send war, pestilence, and famine rather than that he should lose office. The difference between the candidates, declared the *Free Press,* was, "Jackson would sacrifice himself to save the country . . . , and Adams would sacrifice the country to save himself."[45]

Jackson's military reputation was both a liability and an asset. The Adams partisans urged "every man who prefers *civil* to military rule" to sustain the administration.[46] Jacksonians urged the people to show their gratitude for Jackson's services to the country by raising him to the presidency, and Dennis Heartt facetiously suggested that *Old Ironsides* be made president.[47] But ridicule and attempts to raise the specter of military rule could not lessen the respect most people felt for the "Hero of New Orleans."

The hero's military reputation was vulnerable on at least one account. Jackson had ordered the execution of six militiamen, and the Adams press devoted more space to the charge that their death had been unnecessary than to any other issue. Joseph Gales printed copies of a War Department document concerning the executions and circulated them widely. The *Yadkin and Catawba Journal* declared the documents exposed the "naked truth" that the militiamen had been "murdered."[48] James Manney and other partisans distributed "coffin bills," which included pathetic accounts of the militia executions.[49] The Jackson men were alarmed at the change in political sentiment which they believed the stories of the six militiamen had caused.[50] The *Star* declared, "Some . . . wretch who would sell himself for a little *treasury pap*" had written the documents. The Jackson men edited and published another account of the militia executions.[51] The *Western Carolinian* printed a letter

[43] Raleigh *Register,* June 6, 1828; New Bern *Spectator,* September 13, 1828.
[44] Samuel Carson, *To the Freemen,* 7; Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* June 17, 1828.
[45] Tarboro *Free Press,* August 29, 1828.
[46] Salisbury *Yadkin and Catawba Journal,* November 4, 1828.
[47] Hillsboro *Recorder,* August 6, 1828.
[48] Raleigh *Register,* May 29, 1828; Salisbury *Yadkin and Catawba Journal,* July 1, 1828.
[49] James Manney to editor of the *Star,* New Bern *Spectator,* July 26, 1829; [John Binns] *Some Accounts of the Bloody Deeds of General Jackson,* broadside in John H. Bryan Collection, Personal Papers.
[50] James Bryan to John H. Bryan, New Bern, May 17, 1828, John H. Bryan Collection, Personal Papers.
[51] Raleigh *Star,* May 8, June 12, 1828.

which Washington had written telling of his execution of two militiamen. Philo White ridiculed the pathos which usually followed accounts of Jackson's executions, and wrote: "Washington, a Murderer—Two *poor militia men* shot to death by General Washington, in cold blood. One had a wife and *sixteen* children, the other five step mothers."[52] Neither documentary reports nor ridicule could cause anti-Jackson men to cease their attacks.

The militia murders were not the only crimes with which administration partisans charged Andrew Jackson. They discussed many of Jackson's early quarrels to show that his violent temper would make him an undesirable president. Although the Jackson press asserted that their candidate had a gentle disposition, the Adams men had enough evidence to develop a strong case.[53] The Adams journals declared that the elevation of such a rash person as Jackson to the highest office in the land endangered the security of the country and made war likely.[54]

The Adams press was not content merely to call Jackson a murderer and a brawler; he was a traitor as well. They printed letters to show that Jackson had received money from Aaron Burr and tried to prove that he was involved in Burr's conspiracy.[55] Willis Alston came to Jackson's rescue with a most unlikely story. According to Alston, Burr had told Jackson that the government had authorized him to invade Mexico. Jackson reported the conversation to President Thomas Jefferson and stated that he would join Burr if authority had been given for the invasion. If not, Jackson stood ready to arrest the conspirator. Alston swore that his account was based on a conversation with Jefferson.[56]

Although the people had expected an abusive campaign, the more moderate were shocked at the extreme partisanship. Some of the statements about Jackson's domestic relations violated the canons of good taste. In May, 1827, the *Register* copied from a New England paper letters and court records to prove that Rachel had committed adultery with Andrew while she was married to Lewis Robards. The *Register* referred to Jackson as the "adulterer," and the *Star* rushed to his defense.[57] Occasionally the administration press would accuse Jackson of "taking his neighbor's wife," but more generally Jackson's followers referred to the charges in order to deny them.[58] The partisans of

[52] Extract of a letter from George Washington to Marquis De Chastelleux, January 28, 1780, in Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* June 17, 1828.
[53] Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* July 28, 1826.
[54] Raleigh *Register,* January 29, 1828; New Bern *Spectator,* October 18, 1828.
[55] Hillsboro *Recorder,* September 10, 1828; Salisbury *Yadkin and Catawba Journal,* August 28, 1828.
[56] "Certificate of Willis Alston," Tarboro *Free Press,* September 12, 1828, quoting Richmond *Enquirer.*
[57] Raleigh *Register,* May 15, 22, 1828, quoting the Raleigh *Star.*
[58] Salisbury *Yadkin and Catawba Journal,* September 10, 17, 1828; Raleigh *Star,* August 21, 1828

Andrew Jackson realized that most people felt revulsion when reading political attacks on the character of an elderly woman.[59]

Even more revolting than the story concerning Jackson and his wife was the "dirty tale" about Jackson's mother. Charles Hammond of Ohio sent a new version of Jackson's birth to Tobias Watkins. Hammond declared that in 1759 or 1760 two camp followers from England had arrived in North Carolina with the army. One of the camp followers, Fanny Jennings, had two sons. The second was by a mulatto quadroon slave named Jack, and the court took her child and named it Jack's Son. The lad was bound to a lawyer named Avery or Emery from Burke County, North Carolina. The lawyer eventually became a colonel. Hammond cited as his authority William Rogers, "an aged but respected" Ohioan, who claimed to have known Jackson as a boy.[60]

Watkins hoped that the story was true, and in a friendly note to William Gaston he enclosed Hammond's letter. He hinted that it would help their cause if a man of Gaston's reputation and knowledge of North Carolina would make the story known.[61] Watkins also wrote Lewis Williams and gave him the same facts.[62] Williams believed the story and hoped he could find additional proof before promulgating the account. He sent his letter to General William Lenoir and introduced Hammond with flowery praise.[63] He hoped that the close relationship between General Lenoir and Colonel Isaac T. Avery of Burke County would enable Lenoir to verify the story. Avery, an elector on the Adams ticket, neither publicly confirmed nor denied the story.

No public action was taken by Williams or Gaston, but the story became known. An obscure Ohio paper first published the account. The *Star* denounced the administration partisans for publishing the vile scandal.[64] The *Free Press* poured venom on Clay for subsidizing scandal gatherers. It quoted a letter from Hammond admitting that he had shown to others a certificate calling Jackson's mother a "common prostitute."[65] Hammond declared that he had shown it as an example of the falsehoods that came to his attention and emphatically denied that he had circulated the story. Yet the admission that he had shown the certificate was enough for the purposes of the *Free Press*. It reprinted a letter from an Ohio voter who wrote that he had intended to vote for

[59] Samuel Carson, *To the Freemen*, 2.
[60] Charles Hammond to Tobias Watkins, Cincinnati, July 7, 1828, William Gaston Papers.
[61] Tobias Watkins to William Gaston, Washington, July 15, 1828, William Gaston Papers.
[62] Tobias Watkins to Lewis Williams, Washington, July, 1828, Lenoir Family Papers.
[63] Lewis Williams to William Lenoir, Surry County, July 29, 1828, Lenoir Family Papers. Colonel Avery was a son-in-law of General Lenoir.
[64] Raleigh *Star*, September 11, 1828.
[65] Charles Hammond to G. Fleming, August 3, 1828, Tarboro *Free Press*, September 12, 1828.

Adams, but, after finding out that the Adams press printed such vulgar slanders, he had decided to vote for Jackson. Editor Howard urged his readers to do the same.[66]

The administration supporters objected to this type of attack. The New Bern *Spectator* denied that any administration journal had ever published the story.[67] The Hillsboro *Recorder* asserted that a Jackson paper had first published the account, and editor Dennis Heartt told the Jackson men to "take back the dirty tale of their own invention."[68]

In North Carolina, as elsewhere in the nation, Jackson won by a landslide. A large number of voters came to the polls, and Jackson's popular vote exceeded the total number voting in 1824. On election day 37,857 people voted for Jackson electors and only 13,918 cast ballots for the Adams ticket. Adams carried only eight counties: Beaufort, Brunswick, Carteret, Jones, and Pitt in the East; and Randolph, Guilford, and Iredell in the West. Adams was strongest in counties which had a large percentage of Quakers voting and in counties where Federalism had been strong. The five counties which had been strongest for Crawford in 1824, Caswell, Person, Granville, Warren, and Baden, gave Jackson overwhelming majorities. Jackson carried the far western counties by even greater majorities than he had in 1824.[69] Adams men were shocked by the size of Jackson's majority.[70] All factions of the Jackson party were jubilant, but the victory in no way unified the party.

[66] William B. Cassidy to editor of the Cincinnati *National Republican,* Tarboro *Free Press,* September 12, 1828.
[67] New Bern *Spectator,* August 9, 1828.
[68] Hillsboro *Recorder,* September 17, 1828.
[69] Salisbury *Yadkin and Catawba Journal,* December 9, 1828.
[70] William C. Warren of Tyrrell County to Ebenezer Pettigrew, New London, Virginia, December 12, 1828, Pettigrew Papers, III.

CHAPTER IV

THE SPAIGHT FACTION AND THE ELECTION OF SENATORS

"There is in all ardent minds a solicitude for distinction—and in our country political distinction is the great object of excitement."

William Gaston[1]

"There is a patent right party here of exclusive Republicans, who wish to rule everything and proscribe the Old Federalists."

Raleigh correspondent
to New Bern *Spectator*[2]

Simultaneously with the increasing interest in national politics, state politics called forth aroused enthusiasm. In the legislature of 1828 conservatives and radicals battled over state banking policy, but no permanent alliances resulted. Instead, two factions were forming to try to gain the important offices of the state, and radicals and conservatives were found in both factions. Gradually the two factions developed some of the attributes of political parties and tried to go on record for the principles in which they believed.

The first contest leading to the formation of the two factions was the fight for the speakership of the Senate. Richard Dobbs Spaight, the most prominent member of the Old Republicans since Bartlett Yancey's death, desired the position. Jesse Speight of Green County, an original Jackson man, also sought the post, and James Welborn and William Davidson were also placed in nomination. Richard Dobbs Spaight and Jesse Speight each received seventeen votes on the second ballot, but by the fourth ballot Speight picked up nine votes from supporters of Welborn and Davidson and won the position.[3] The defeat of Richard Dobbs Spaight was partially due to his lack of personal popularity, but it also indicated that a majority of the politicians desired to combine against the Old Republicans.

More important than the battle over the speakership of the state Senate was the contest for two seats in the United States Senate. John Branch was up for reelection and the anti-Jackson men desired his

[1] William Gaston to Susan Donaldson, New Bern, February 20, 1830, William Gaston Papers.
[2] December 4, 1830.
[3] New Bern *Spectator*, November 29, 1828.

defeat.[4] A group of eastern anti-Jackson men approached Westerners who were associated with Charles Fisher's faction and promised to support any candidate on whom the West could unite. The Westerners, who were Jackson men and generally friendly to Branch, refused the offer.[5] Lewis Williams considered opposing Branch, but he ascertained that his own opposition to Jackson would cause him to be defeated, and he decided not to enter the race.[6] Branch was reelected without opposition.

A real contest developed for the other Senate seat. Nathaniel Macon had long felt he was getting too old to be useful, and after the presidential election of 1828 he sent his resignation to the legislature.[7] The Westerners who had rejected the offer of eastern partisans of Clay and Adams received a similar offer from certain eastern Jacksonians.[8] Jesse Wilson and Montfort Stokes were the leading western candidates, but Stokes would not give way to Wilson, and many Westerners disliked Stokes, or thought him incapable. One conservative Westerner declared that if Stokes became senator the state would be "numerically but . . . not . . . intellectually represented."[9] In a caucus of Stokes' western enemies Wilson received the largest number of votes, but several were willing to support Charles Fisher.[10]

Stokes and Fisher were leaders of a group of Westerners who usually stood together in struggles for office. These "Western Republicans" loudly proclaimed their own devotion to Republican principles and championed revision of the state constitution to bring equal rights to the West. They had supported Jackson and Calhoun in 1824 and 1828, and although not quite as strong as the Old Republicans they were the second strongest faction in the state. The Stokes-Fisher faction had a tendency to be more radical on state issues than the Old Republican group.

The Old Republicans who lived in the West and the other conservative Westerners would support neither Fisher nor Stokes for senator, and they decided to throw their votes to Governor James Iredell, an Easterner who favored "western rights."[11] Iredell easily won

[4] "North Carolina to Honorable General Assembly," New Bern *Spectator* November 1, 1828.

[5] "Native Citizen" in Raleigh *Star*, October 8, 1829.

[6] Lewis Williams to William Gaston, Surry County, September 29, 1828, William Gaston Papers.

[7] Nathaniel Macon to Bartlett Yancey, February 15, 1826, Wilson, "Letters of Nathaniel Macon and Others," 83-84; Raleigh *Register*, November 21, 1828.

[8] "Native Citizen" in Raleigh *Star*, October 8, 1829.

[9] Thomas Polk to William Polk, Salisbury, December 10, 1828, William Polk Papers.

[10] Frederick Nash to Thomas Ruffin, November 22, 1828, *Thomas Ruffin Papers*, I, 457.

[11] Hugh Waddell to William A. Graham, Raleigh, November 30, [1828], William A. Graham Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North

the election, defeating Stokes by a vote of ninety-one to fifty-two.[12] The Old Republicans had supported no candidate, and the Stokes-Fisher Republicans had found themselves isolated.

Iredell's elevation to the Senate left the governorship open, and another contest developed. The Old Republicans supported Richard Dobbs Spaight, and Stokes entered the race with the backing of his faction. John Owen, an ambitious politician from Bladen County, was a third major candidate, and Willis Alston and James Mebane were nominated. On the first ballot Spaight led with Owen second, and by the end of the third ballot Stokes and the other candidates had withdrawn. With Stokes out of the race the majority of the Stokes-Fisher group voted against Spaight and Owen won the election.[13] Both Republican factions had again been defeated.

The two defeated factions had frequently clashed in contests for office, yet they generally professed similar principles and were like-minded on national issues. Both groups favored strict construction of the constitution and opposed federal internal improvements. Both groups were now supporting Andrew Jackson. Both groups denounced Federalism. An alliance between the two would be to the interest of both.

Having been defeated in four major contests, the two factions gradually drew together. They called themselves the Republican party, but their enemies called them the "Spaight faction," the "patent rights party," or merely "the party." The most prominent member of "the party" was Richard Dobbs Spaight, leader of the Old Republicans. He was not a popular man and frequently received defeats in attempts to gain office. Spaight was proud of his long-time association with Republican principles, and his local enemies referred to him as "the gentleman of the Old School."[14] Charles Fisher was almost as influential in the faction as was Spaight. Fisher was ardent in whatever he was championing and was either loved or hated. Like Spaight, Fisher constantly proclaimed his love for Republican principles, and the newspaper devoted to his interest never failed to denounce as a Federalist anyone who opposed Charles Fisher.[15] Other prominent members of the group were Montfort Stokes, Willie P. Mangum, John R. Donnell, Jessie Bynum, William W. Steadman, Spencer O'Brien, and Romulus M. Saunders.

The connecting link between the groups was Saunders. In 1827 he considered moving to Salisbury to recoup his fortunes and made

Carolina, Chapel Hill. Hereinafter cited W. A. Graham Papers, University of North Carolina.

[13] Salisbury *Yadkin and Catawba Journal*, December 9, 1828.

[13] New Bern *Spectator*, December 13, 1828.

[14] New Bern *Spectator*, December 25, 1830.

[15] Salisbury *Western Carolinian*, November 18, 1831, December 7, 1832.

special efforts to become friendly with Fisher.[16] Saunders had a love for politics and enjoyed playing a part in secret political management. He was an avid office seeker and in 1828 desired the post of attorney general. He united many Old Republicans and the Stokes-Fisher group in support of his candidacy. Although five other candidates were nominated he won a majority on the first ballot.[17]

The enemies of the Spaight faction were not idle, and they also formed a strong faction. David Caldwell of Salisbury and William J. Alexander of Charlotte led Western politicians who were either ex-Federalists or personal enemies of the Fisher group. Both western leaders were personally opposed to Andrew Jackson. John Owen and Jesse Speight, both Jackson men, led eastern Republicans who had no objection to state cooperation with Federalists and anti-Jackson men. James Iredell, William Gaston, and William Meares were prominent ex-Federalists who cooperated with the enemies of the Spaight faction. About half the group were partisans of Clay and Adams. The group was divided on most issues but generally favored internal improvements. They called themselves "independents," but showed more partisanship than the Spaight faction.[18] To some extent they were the forerunners of the Whig party, and they always denounced their rivals for excessive partisanism. Yet the "independents" acted in a more partisan manner than their enemies.

In the summer of 1829, while politicians were forming alliances, the people went to the polls to elect congressmen and legislators. A bitter fight concerning state banking policy was raging throughout the state, and Robert Potter, the leader of the anti-bank agitation, became a candidate for Congress from the Granville district. Incumbent Daniel Turner decided to retire. Samuel Hillman, a conservative, opposed the anti-bank leader. Potter received 2,661 votes while only 396 people voted for Hillman.[19] Potter favored Jackson. In two other congressional races there was division between conservative and radical. In the Elizabeth City district, William B. Shepard, an ultra-conservative aristocrat, believed he would receive every "respectable vote," but his opponent Lemuel Sawyer, a "demagogue" would receive votes from the "lower orders."[20] Shepard, an Adams man, defeated Jackson supporter Sawyer by 347 votes.[21] In the Fayetteville district John Cameron, an

[16] Romulus Saunders to Bartlett Yancey, December 20, 1826, Newsome, "Letters of Romulus Saunders," 458.

[17] James Ruffin to Thomas Ruffin, November 24, 1828, *Thomas Ruffin Papers,* I, 459; Raleigh *Register,* December 2, 1828.

[18] Charles L. Hinton to Willie P. Mangum, November 18, 1830, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* I, 381.

[19] Raleigh *Register,* April 24, June 19, July 23, 1829; Halifax *Minerva,* August 25, 1829.

[20] William B. Shepard to Mary Bryan, Fairfield, June 9, 1829, John H. Bryan Collection, Personal Papers.

[21] Halifax *Minerva,* August 25, 1829.

enemy of state banks, opposed conservative Edmund Deberry. Cameron was editor of the pro-Jackson *North Carolina Journal,* while Deberry had been an elector on the Adams ticket. Deberry won the election by about two hundred votes.[22] The victories of Deberry and Shepard showed that in spite of Potter's victory no trend toward radicalism was developing in the voting habits of the people.

The other congressional races were primarily tests of personal popularity. Three Adams congressmen, Lewis Williams, Daniel Barringer, and Gabriel Holmes defeated candidates who proclaimed their support of Jackson. The Jackson partisans won two victories. Jesse Speight decisively defeated two Adams men to fill the seat voluntarily vacated by John H. Bryan.[23] John Giles defeated incumbent John Long, but, because of ill health and a desire to retain his county clerkship, Giles resigned.[24] In a special election to fill the vacancy another Jackson partisan, Abraham Rencher, defeated Long.[25] Henry W. Connor, Willis Alston, Thomas Hall, Augustine Shepperd, and Samuel Carson were re-elected without opposition. In these elections the people voted for a candidate because they liked or respected him personally, not because he favored a certain national candidate or a particular economic policy.

At the same time that the people elected congressmen they voted for legislators. An almost equal number from each of the two main factions won elections. The Caldwell-Alexander-Owen group ran no candidate for speaker of the Senate, and Bedford Brown was elected to the post. The factions ran rival western leaders, Fisher and Alexander, for speaker of the House, and Alexander triumphed.[26]

John Branch had received a position in President Jackson's cabinet, and the 1829 legislature had the duty of electing a senator to replace him. Many men aspired to the post, and personal ambitions threatened to break up the newly-formed factions. Westerners were loud in their demand for a western senator, and at least eleven Westerners were mentioned for the position. Eastern newspapers, noting the multitude of western candidates, predicted that the West would again be divided and suggested seven different leaders from their section to fill the post.[27] Jesse Wilson was the strongest candidate of the Caldwell-Alexander group, but before the legislature convened Wilson died. Politicians

[22] John A. Cameron, *To the Freemen of Richmond, Robeson, Cumberland, Anson, Montgomery, and Moore,* broadside dated June 20, 1820, in Edmund Deberry Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

[23] Raleigh *Register,* August 20, 1829.

[24] John Giles to Thomas Ruffin, September 22, 1829, *Thomas Ruffin Papers,* I, 519.

[25] Salisbury *Yadkin and Catawba Journal,* December 21, 1829.

[26] New Bern *Spectator,* November 19, 1829.

[27] Raleigh *Star,* October 8, 1829; Salisbury *Yadkin and Catawba Journal,* October 27, 1829; Hillsboro *Recorder,* October 21, 1829.

talked of uniting on David L. Swain, but the twenty-eight year old Buncombe lawyer was constitutionally ineligible.[28] The group finally decided on an eastern ex-Federalist, William B. Meares. Charles Fisher was the strongest candidate of the Spaight faction, but as usual Montfort Stokes desired the position and was an active candidate. Both factions had hope of victory.

When the legislators met, the Senate race was almost the only subject of conversation. The Caldwell-Alexander-Owen faction nominated Meares, and to counteract Meares' sectional strength the eastern members of the Spaight faction nominated Judge John R. Donnell. Western members of the Spaight group nominated Stokes and held Fisher in reserve. Samuel Carson and Archibald D. Murphey were also nominated. Donnell led on the first ballot, followed by Meares. By the fourth ballot Carson and Murphey had been withdrawn, and Meares took the lead, not to be headed until the final ballot. On the twelfth ballot Stokes withdrew, and his friends nominated Fisher. The new western candidate won the votes of his western faction, and many of the Easterners who had been voting for Donnell shifted to him. By the fourteenth ballot Fisher and Meares were tied, and Donnell was a poor third. Donnell's friends held the balance of power and would have to choose whether to support their faction or their section. They agreed to withdraw Donnell after one more ballot, and several who had been voting for Fisher shifted back in order to enable Donnell to retire with a respectable vote. Fisher, noting his vote decrease, withdrew and asked his friends to support some other western man who would be more appealing to the eastern members of his faction. They nominated Bedford Brown, who defeated Meares by ninety-five votes to eighty-six votes.[29] The majority of the eastern members of the Spaight group had put faction before section.

The members of the Caldwell-Alexander-Owen faction raised an outcry against the "party juggling" that brought about Brown's election.[30] They described Brown as a man of limited intelligence, and said it was a disgrace that he had been selected in preference to William Meares.[31] Defenders of the Spaight faction rushed to Brown's support. A "native Carolinian" admitted that two political parties existed and declared the Republican party had defeated the sneaky "Federal phalanx."[32]

The factions were to renew their rivalry the following year. James

[28] Thomas Ruffin to David L. Swain, Hillsboro, October 15, 1829, William M. Robards to Swain, August 16, 1829, D. L. Barringer to Swain [Raleigh], October 19, 1829, David L. Swain Correspondence, III.

[29] Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* January 5, 1830, quoting Milton *Gazette;* Raleigh *Register,* December 3, 10, 1829.

[30] Joseph B. Skinner to Thomas Ruffin, December 29, 1829, *Thomas Ruffin Papers,* I, 521.

[31] Frances Iredell to James Iredell, Raleigh, December 10, 1829, Johnson Papers.

[32] "Native Carolinian" in Halifax *Minerva,* February 4, 1830.

Iredell announced he would not seek reelection and urged the selection of a Jackson man to fill his place.[33] Jesse Speight, as staunch a Jacksonian as one could find, had senatorial ambitions, but he agreed to support Owen as the faction's candidate.[34] The Federalist and anti-Jackson wing of the party strongly pressed William Gaston to enter the race, but Gaston refused to stand in the way of Owen's ambition.[35]

The Spaight faction was not idle. Montfort Stokes, a perennial candidate, again desired the position, but his faction had given up hope of electing him and would not support his candidacy. Members of the Caldwell-Alexander-Owen group, hoping to divide the Spaight faction, encouraged Stokes' aspirations and tried to win his immediate friends to their faction.[36] Some members of the Spaight faction held conferences and decided that either Donnell, Fisher, Mangum, or Romulus Saunders deserved support. Fisher and Saunders decided against making the race, and the faction was about evenly divided between Donnell and Mangum.[37]

As the legislature convened, a veteran politician observed that he had "never seen party feeling run half so high."[38] The trial of strength came during the elections for speakers. In the Senate, David Caldwell defeated Spaight by three votes, but in the House Fisher gained the victory over Alexander by nine votes. Although there were a few politicians who voted without regard to factional alignment, the speakership contests indicated victory for the Spaight faction providing it could remain united.[39]

Willie P. Mangum desired a seat in the United States Senate. Charles L. Hinton and William Sneed, members of the Caldwell-Alexander-Owen faction and friends of Mangum, received authorization to place his name in nomination. When Donnell's friends heard that Mangum would be nominated, most, but not all, of them reluctantly accepted Mangum as the candidate of their faction.[40]

Hinton and Sneed had not deserted their faction. They held frequent conversations with their leaders concerning the plan to nominate Mangum and received encouragement. Alexander told them he despaired of Owen's success and would support Mangum in order to de-

[33] Raleigh *Star,* September 9, 1830.
[34] Tarboro *Free Press,* February 15, 1831, quoting Salisbury *Western Carolinian.*
[35] William Gaston to Susan Donaldson, New Bern, February 20, 1830, William Gaston Papers.
[36] [Charles Fisher] "Notes on the Conduct of the Famous Gen. Jessie Speight—On the Senatorial Election," [1830], Fisher Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.
[37] Tarboro *Free Press,* February 15, 1831, quoting Salisbury *Western Carolinian.*
[38] C. L. Hinton to Willie P. Mangum, November 18, 1830, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* I, 381.
[39] Halifax *Minerva,* November 25, 1830.
[40] C. L. Hinton to Willie P. Mangum, November 18, 1830, William Sneed to Willie P. Mangum, December 5, 1830, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* I, 384, 385; Tarboro *Free Press,* February 15, 1831, quoting Salisbury *Western Carolinian.*

feat Donnell.[41] Sneed and Hinton believed that if they made the nomination they would enable their faction to gain the prestige of victory. A few members of the Caldwell-Alexander-Owen faction were sincere in following the plan of Hinton and Sneed, but most of them were using it to embroil the supporters of Donnell and Mangum, and thereby ensure Owen's success.[42] They almost succeeded.

Edward Ward and Jesse Bynum, both members of the Spaight faction, nominated Mangum. Ward had persuaded Hinton to defer Mangum's nomination until November 25, and on that date the members of the Spaight faction gained the floor before Hinton or Sneed could do so. The Owen men professed disgust at seeing the nomination come from the rival faction, and, with very few exceptions, they refused to support Mangum.[43] Stokes was placed in nomination, and after the balloting had begun Owen was nominated. On the first ballot Mangum received eighty votes, but Spaight and about a dozen other members of the faction refused to support him. Stokes received sixty-seven votes, but after Owen was nominated Stokes' vote fell greatly. On the fourth ballot Owen and Mangum had eighty-nine votes each, and Stokes' vote had fallen to eleven.[44]

Willie P. Mangum believed that Owen had tricked him. He wrote letters to Hinton and Ward denouncing Owen. Mangum wrote Owen a note admitting, "I have implicated your political principles in the strongest and most unequivocal manner."[45] Owen regarded the letter as a challenge to a duel, but no duel occurred. Mangum also wrote Saunders asking that his name be withdrawn. Before Saunders received the letter authorizing Mangum's withdrawal, a fifth ballot found Mangum trailing his rival by eleven votes. After Mangum wrote the letter denouncing Owen, Spaight gave Mangum his support.[46] Mangum's attack on Owen served to clarify the factional lineup.

After conferring with Spaight and other leaders, Saunders decided not to withdraw Mangum's name. He succeeded in postponing the balloting and urged Mangum to come to Raleigh. He believed that

[41] William Sneed to Willie P. Mangum, November 18, 1830, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* I, 380.

[42] William Sneed to Willie P. Mangum, November 25, 1830, Charles L. Hinton to Willie P. Mangum, November 18, 1830, Romulus Saunders to Willie P. Mangum, December 3, 1830, Willie P. Mangum to John Owen, December 2, 1830, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* I, 382, 386, 388, 391; Tarboro *Free Press,* February 15, 1831, quoting Salisbury *Western Carolinian.*

[43] William Sneed to Willie P. Mangum, December 3, 1830, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* I, 393-394.

[44] Raleigh *Register,* December 2, 1830.

[45] Willie P. Mangum to John Owen, December 1, 1830, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* I, 388-389.

[46] John Owen to Willie P. Mangum, December 4, 1830, Romulus Saunders to Willie P. Mangum, December 3, 1830, William Sneed to Willie P. Mangum, December 3, 1830, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* I, 389-395.

Mangum could win back the wavering members of the Spaight faction.[47] Mangum arrived and convinced the faction he was wholeheartedly one of them. Owen had advocated internal improvements which were "clearly and undeniably national," and this was one issue on which the Spaight faction based their opposition to the rival leader.[48] In Raleigh, Mangum openly and unequivocally declared that the federal government had no constitutional right to appropriate one cent for internal improvements. He also denied that he had waned in support of Jackson. He thereby won the wavering members of his faction, and Donnell came to Raleigh to urge his followers to support Mangum. When the balloting was resumed Mangum led Owen by ten votes, and on a final ballot he was elected 103 to 84.[49]

John Owen was much mortified by his defeat. He refused to stand for reelection as governor and sulked away from the capital in great disgust. Members of Owen's faction tried to induce Senator Iredell to be their candidate, but he declined.[50] Richard Dobbs Spaight was his faction's candidate, but as usual Montfort Stokes also sought the office. On the first ballot about half the Caldwell-Alexander-Owen group voted for Jesse Speight, while the other half voted for Stokes in an effort to split the reunited Spaight faction. Jesse Speight's name was withdrawn and two other "independents" failed. Finally the Caldwell-Alexander-Owen faction voted almost unanimously for Stokes and defeated Richard Dobbs Spaight.[51] Stokes was still a member of the "Republican" faction, so his success was not considered a defeat for the Spaight group.

The Spaight faction stood for strict construction of the constitution. After the elections were over Jesse Bynum introduced a resolution declaring federal internal improvements unconstitutional. Owen's advocacy of a "judicious system" of national internal improvements tended to place his faction on record against such a resolution.[52] In the House the Spaight faction leaders encouraged their followers to support the resolution, and as they had a majority the resolution passed. In the Senate, Spaight and Caldwell led their opposing factions in the debate; Caldwell's forces were able to defeat the resolution. By their association with Bynum's resolution the Spaight faction took its stand as the party opposed to internal improvements.[53]

[47] Romulus Saunders to Willie P. Mangum, December 3, 1830, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* I, 391-392.

[48] Owen's annual message, New Bern *Spectator,* November 27, 1830.

[49] "Lucius" in Raleigh *Standard,* December 5, 1834; Tarboro *Free Press,* February 15, 1831, quoting Salisbury *Western Carolinian;* New Bern *Spectator,* December 6, 1830.

[50] Frances Iredell to James Iredell, Raleigh, December 10, 16, 1830, Johnson Papers.

[51] Raleigh *Register,* December 16, 1830.

[52] John Owen, Message to Legislature, New Bern *Spectator,* November 27, 1830.

[53] Tarboro *Free Press,* December 21, 28, 1830, January 4, 1831.

This association linked them with Andrew Jackson's most popular act, as far as North Carolina was concerned. In the spring of 1830 Jackson signed the Maysville veto, and the editor of the Halifax *Minerva* spoke honestly when he declared, "We have never witnessed warmer expressions of approbation in favor of any public measure."[54] On July 4 in Salisbury Charles Fisher gave this toast:

> Andrew Jackson: The firm and patriotic stand which he has taken in defense of the rights of the states and the pockets of the people is of more real importance than a hundred such battles as New Orleans.[55]

Similar words of praise were often expressed after the famous veto.

By the veto the Spaight faction gained new recruits. William D. Mosely, soon to emerge as a Democratic leader, had opposed Jackson because he had fear of a military man. After the veto he became a firm Jacksonian, ready to cooperate with the faction of exclusive Jackson supporters.[56]

The Spaight faction wanted to go on record as the friend of Andrew Jackson. The Jackson men in the rival faction likewise wanted an association with the popular president. Louis Henry, then a close friend of Governor Owen, introduced a resolution recommending Jackson's reelection. Henry's resolution was tabled to be heard of no more, and several similar resolutions met the same fate. January 4, 1831, Governor Stokes sent to the General Assembly an Alabama resolution approving Jackson's conduct and recommending his reelection. Jesse Bynum moved that North Carolina adopt the resolution, and he added an amendment specifically approving the Maysville veto. In the House it was not a factional issue, and Bynum's proposal was approved by a vote of ninety-seven to nine. In the Senate William Meares led a group of anti-Jackson men who denied the right of the legislature to make a nomination. The other members of the Caldwell faction voted with the anti-Jackson wing and opposed the resolution. They passed a resolution that vaguely approved Jackson's course but did not recommend reelection. Spaight had led the Jackson forces in the Senate, and when their resolution failed he drew up an official protest condemning the majority of the Senate for refusing to recommend Jackson's reelection. Spaight's protest received much notice in the press and helped to publicize his faction's devotion to Andrew Jackson.[57]

The Spaight faction was beginning to act like a disciplined political party. In 1829 its most prominent candidates had given up senatorial

[54] Halifax *Minerva,* June 1, 1830.
[55] Raleigh *Register,* July 19, 1830, quoting Salisbury *Western Carolinian.*
[56] William D. Moseley to James K. Polk, December 1, 1830, McPherson, "Letters to James K. Polk," 63.
[57] Raleigh *Star,* January 6, 13, 20, 1831; Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* January 24, 1831.

ambitions so another member of the faction could succeed. It had survived the 1830 election when Willie P. Mangum's ambitions threatened to disrupt the group, and it emerged reunited, ready to go on record for the principles its leaders proclaimed. The faction tried to get the people to regard it as the Jackson Republican party and was partially successful. Yet in the rival faction there were many independent Republicans who were recognized champions of Andrew Jackson. The most prominent Jacksonian was John Branch, and he was associated with neither group. As long as Branch remained the recognized Jackson leader, the Spaight faction could not become the Jackson party.

CHAPTER V

THE DISMISSAL OF JOHN BRANCH AND ITS POLITICAL REPERCUSSIONS IN NORTH CAROLINA

"It was thought I durst not change my cabinet, because if I did it would arouse . . . North Carolina . . . against me."
Andrew Jackson[1]

"Mr. Branch still retains our affection and confidence. . . . We have not become so corrupt to denounce a man . . . because he will not compromise his honor and dignity at the shrine of despotism and power . . . or suffer himself to be hemmed to the petticoat of a modern Cleopatra."
"R." to editor
Halifax *Minerva*[2]

John Branch, the first cabinet member from North Carolina, was an important leader in state politics. His father had been sheriff of Halifax County and an important political figure, and John Branch knew the importance of standing well with local politicians. At an early age he entered the legislature, where his ambitious and energetic activities made him leader of a Republican faction. Although defeated for the United States Senate in 1814, he became governor in 1817 and twice won reelection. The Senate seat occupied by Montfort Stokes became his goal, and in 1822 he won enough legislators to his side to defeat both Stokes and Old Republican leader Bartlett Yancey. Branch excessively flattered politicians he wished to use. Until his resignation from the cabinet, Branch had usually succeeded in lining up political leaders to support his aspirations.[3]

John Branch was a popular figure. No man could match him in professing devotion to Republican principles. Branch was governor during a period of great anti-bank sentiment, and he became an outspoken critic of banks and a champion of debtor relief.[4] In the Senate he was an enemy of internal improvements, frequently speaking and

[1] Andrew Jackson to John Coffee, May 13, 1831, *Jackson Correspondence,* IV, 281-282.
[2] Raleigh *Star,* November 1, 1831.
[3] Marshall DeLancey Haywood, "John Branch, Secretary of the Navy in the Cabinet of President Jackson, etc.," *The North Carolina Booklet* (Raleigh), XV (October, 1915), 50-61; *Archibald D. Murphey Papers,* I, 98; William Omer Foster, "The Life of Montfort Stokes" (Unpublished master's thesis, University of North Carolina, 1939), 44-45.
[4] Newsome, *Election of 1824,* 27-30.

proclaiming his strict construction principles; but when an internal improvement bill in which Branch's constituents had a direct interest reached the floor, he declared it a military necessity and gave it his vote.[5] Branch knew how to stand well with the people.

John Henry Eaton guided Jackson in his cabinet selections, and they decided to give one position to North Carolina.[6] William Polk was Jackson's campaign manager in North Carolina while Branch was the hero's most ardent advocate, and either would have been a logical choice for a position. Polk was elderly and had no personal cabinet aspirations, but he let it be known that he would be pleased if his son-in-law, George Badger, should become Attorney General.[7] Polk went to Washington to consult Samuel Carson concerning the best manner of bringing Badger's claim before Jackson.[8] Badger was little known outside the state, and Jackson and Eaton had no desire to select a cabinet of unknowns.[9] Polk had some influence with them, and they would not have selected a person whom he disapproved.

For the past few years John Branch had been skilfully bringing his own claim before Jackson. He had poured vitriolic abuse on the Clay-Adams men, and Jackson appreciated Branch's defense of his "cause."[10] Branch found other ways to appeal to Jackson. He wrote extremely flattering letters to Jackson, and named his son, born January 8, anniversary of the New Orleans victory, Andrew Jackson Branch. This action deeply touched the old hero's heart.[11] Branch frequently flattered John Henry Eaton, and acted as if he were a close friend. The day after Eaton married Margaret O'Neale Timberlake, Branch called to offer congratulations.[12] Branch had not neglected William Polk in his campaign of praising those who might aid his personal aspirations. Branch wrote Polk letters filled with excessive flattery, and gave Polk a small bust of George Washington. The accompanying note told Polk that he was so much like Washington in his patriotism and service to

[5] *Register of Debates in Congress,* II, Part 1 [Serially numbered 44], 712-714, 720.

[6] Memorandum, January 20, 1831, *Jackson Correspondence,* IV, 235.

[7] Archibald D. Murphey to Thomas Ruffin, February 3, 1829, *Archibald D. Murphey Papers,* I, 468.

[8] Samuel Carson to William Polk, Washington, January 29, 1829, William Polk Papers.

[9] The charge that Jackson's cabinet was a "Millenium of Minnows" is false. This charge was merely the mutterings of a disappointed politician. Actually all six had proven their ability to succeed in the great game of politics. William S. Hoffmann, "The Origins of the Jackson Party" (Unpublished master's thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1950), 191-197.

[10] Andrew Jackson to John Branch, Hermitage, March 3, 1826, December 11, 1827, W. H. Branch Papers.

[11] Andrew Jackson to John Branch, Hermitage, March 3, 1828, W. H. Branch Papers.

[12] John Henry Eaton, "A Candid Appeal to the People of the United States in Answer to Messrs. Berrien, Branch and Ingham," New Bern *Spectator,* September 30, 1831. Hereinafter cited as "Candid Appeal."

the country that John Branch considered it an honor and a privilege to give him the statue.[13] When Jackson and Eaton decided the senior senator from North Carolina would make an excellent Secretary of the Navy, Polk could hardly raise objections.

North Carolinians were pleased to have a cabinet member from their state. Editors praised the selection and printed items from northern papers which made favorable comments about Branch. Citizens offered toasts to Jackson for appointing a North Carolinian and to Branch for being worthy of the honor. The New Bern *Spectator* and the *Yadkin and Catawba Journal* dissented from the general voice of approval and denounced Branch as a partisan, but the Jackson press rushed to Branch's defense and charged the unfriendly editors with lack of state pride.[14]

Nothing but praise could be found for the way Branch carried out his administrative functions. The state papers occasionally printed Navy Department reports, and the editors usually added a note of praise. The Jackson press cited figures to show that Branch was more efficient than his predecessor.[15] Abraham Rencher wrote his constituents that Branch's "energy, economy and integrity had saved a million dollars annually."[16] When some northern newspapers attacked the Secretary for a decision to scrap *Old Ironsides,* the Jackson press defended Branch and praised his economy.[17]

Branch's administrative functions were less important than his social activities and political intrigues. Washington gossips had frequently noted the friendship of John Henry Eaton for Mrs. Margaret O'Neale Timberlake, and when the two were married Washington ladies tried to drive Margaret Eaton from society. When Jackson announced that he would appoint Eaton Secretary of War the ladies and many of their husbands protested. Branch believed that Eaton's appointment would endanger the administration.[18]

After Branch's appointment had been announced but before he assumed office, he made the greatest mistake of his political career. Branch tried to keep Eaton from becoming Secretary of War. Branch went to Eaton and told him that friends of the administration wanted John McLean elevated to the position of Secretary of War. He suggested that Eaton request a foreign mission. As an alternative Branch proposed that McLean be made Secretary of War, and Eaton and himself go to Jackson and get the President-elect to select one of them as Secretary

[13] John Branch to William Polk, Washington, January 25, 1825, William Polk Papers.

[14] Halifax *Minerva,* July 6, 1829; Raleigh *Star,* March 5, 12, 1829, January 2, 1830; Salisbury *Yadkin and Catawba Journal,* May 2, July 14, 1829; New Bern *Spectator,* October 30, 1829.

[15] Halifax *Minerva,* March 5, 26, 1829, July 15, 1830.

[16] "Rencher's letter," Tarboro *Free Press,* March 3, 1831.

[17] Tarboro *Free Press,* September 18, 1830.

[18] John Branch to Edward B. Freemen, August 22, 1831, quoted in New Bern *Spectator,* September 2, 1831.

of the Navy and the other as Postmaster General. Eaton knew that McLean was a partisan of John C. Calhoun, and that Calhoun's friends opposed Eaton's appointment. He believed Branch was their "dupe."[19]

Eaton accepted Branch's second proposition because he knew Jackson would not demote him to the position of Postmaster General. Jackson was devoted to Eaton and made it clear that he was willing to see Branch retire from the Navy Department. The North Carolinian wanted to retain his secretaryship, and Jackson did not hold Branch to his word. Instead, four days after the administration began McLean was appointed to the Supreme Court. Although Branch retained his cabinet post he had lost the friendship of both Eaton and Jackson.

After Branch was safely sworn into office, he and his family were very pointed in their insults toward Mrs. Eaton.[20] Two ministers circulated an especially vulgar tale concerning Mrs. Eaton, and Jackson called them to a cabinet meeting to expose discrepancies in their stories.[21] Branch invited the ministers to be his house guests. Eaton was extremely angered at this indication that Branch believed the tale. Eaton asked Jackson to request Branch's resignation. Samuel Carson, a partisan of Calhoun, wrote Branch: "*Be cool and let NOTHING goad you to resign.* They must consummate the design by a removal."[22] Branch followed the advice, but Jackson did not remove him. Instead, he suggested that the North Carolinian meet with Eaton, and Branch agreed. At the meeting Branch affirmed great respect for the War Secretary and his wife. Eaton accepted Branch's explanation, and Jackson allowed the Navy Secretary to retain his position.[23]

Jackson regarded Branch and two other offending cabinet ministers as tools of John C. Calhoun. Jackson believed that Branch's whole conduct was part of a diabolical plot to drive Eaton from the cabinet and secure the succession of the South Carolinian. Van Buren's friendly championship of Mrs. Eaton caused Jackson to put forth all his strength to see that Van Buren and not Calhoun should become his successor. Jackson cautiously avoided an open break with the Calhoun partisans but made preparations for the coming struggle.[24]

Jackson feared John Branch. He believed the Navy Secretary's influence was so great that a dismissal might cause him to lose North Carolina. Van Buren suggested that his own and Eaton's resignation would enable the President to reorganize his entire cabinet without seeming to

[19] John Henry Eaton, "Candid Appeal," New Bern *Spectator,* September 30, 1831.

[20] Van Buren, *Autobiography,* 347-382.

[21] Marquis James, *Andrew Jackson: Portrait of a President* (Indianapolis, 1937), 210-213.

[22] Samuel Carson to John Branch, [Washington], January 30, 1830, W. H. Branch Papers.

[23] John H. Eaton, "Candid Appeal," New Bern *Spectator,* September 30, 1831.

[24] William S. Hoffmann, "The Split Between Andrew Jackson and John C. Calhoun" (Unpublished honors essay, University of North Carolina, 1948), 30-45.

dismiss the offensive secretaries. Jackson believed that the "self-sacrifice" of Van Buren and Eaton in resigning would force the other members to resign quietly or be branded as office seekers and disrupters of the party.[25]

Jackson sent for Branch and made it clear that he wanted the Navy Secretary's resignation. Branch resigned and sent a note saying, "It was your wish that I retire."[26] Jackson answered that he had not requested Branch's resignation, but that a complete cabinet reorganization "was necessary to guard against misrepresentation."[27] Branch replied that he had not intended to quote the President's words but merely to give the "substance" of his meaning.[28] Again Jackson answered accepting Branch's resignation and explaining that justice to Van Buren and Eaton required a complete reorganization. To create the illusion of continuing friendship, Jackson praised Branch's service as Navy Department head.[29]

Branch wrote several identical letters explaining that his "dismissal" resulted from a "malign influence" on the President. Base intriguers had prevailed on Jackson to discard "old and long tried supporters" and to place himself in the hands of "persons whose cold hearted selfishness and artifices were played off upon him for true and faithful service."[30] Branch gave permission for his letter to be published, and it made the rounds of the press. John C. Calhoun had recently published correspondence between himself and Jackson and added a long preface denouncing the intriguers who had caused their break. A sizable portion of the press recognized Van Buren as the chief intriguer whom Calhoun was attacking.[31] Like Calhoun, Branch did not mention Van Buren by name, but Branch made it crystal clear that Van Buren was the "malign influence" that had caused his ouster.

Branch's letter produced a furor of excitement. Jackson thought it proved the "weakness, if not depravity" of Branch,[32] but in North Carolina the action of the dismissed Secretary was generally approved. The *Star* regretted that Jackson had been deprived of Branch's service.

[25] Van Buren, *Autobiography,* 403-407; Andrew Jackson to John Coffee, May 13, 1831, *Jackson Correspondence,* IV, 281-282.
[26] John Branch to Andrew Jackson, April 19, 1831, *Jackson Correspondence,* IV, 266.
[27] Andrew Jackson to John Branch, April 19, 1831, *Jackson Correspondence,* IV, 266.
[28] John Branch to Andrew Jackson, April 19, 1831, *Jackson Correspondence,* IV, 266.
[29] Andrew Jackson to John Branch, April 20, 1831, James Parton, *Life of Andrew Jackson,* 3 vols. (New York, 1861), III, 355-356.
[30] John Branch to "A Gentleman in This City," New Bern *Spectator,* May 21, 1831.
[31] Raleigh *Register,* April 17, 1831, quoting Fayetteville *Observer;* New Bern *Spectator,* March 5, 1831.
[32] Andrew Jackson to John Coffee, May 26, 1831, *Jackson Correspondence,* IV, 285.

Editor Alexander Lawrence asserted that Branch was too firm in his Republican principles and too "true" a friend of Andrew Jackson to oppose the administration because of personal mistreatment.[33] The *North Carolina Journal* denounced Branch as a deceitful enemy of the administration, but it reluctantly admitted that it alone of the North Carolina press condemned the popular ex-Secretary.[34] The opposition press called the dismissal "an indignity to . . . the state" and urged Branch to seek vindication.[35] The National Republicans were encouraging the division among the Jackson men.

Branch desired vindication and sought a congressional seat. Willis Alston had decided not to run for reelection and Joseph J. Williams, James G. Mhoon, and Jesse Bynum had declared themselves candidates. Branch's friends urged the ex-Secretary to run, and Branch expressed a willingness to serve. He promised to support the administration. Mhoon and Williams immediately withdrew, but Jesse Bynum momentarily remained in the race.[36] Friends of Branch wrote letters to the newspapers or gave toasts at public banquets urging that Branch "by a unanimous vote be returned to the scene of his unvaried triumph in the cause of justice, liberty and virtue."[37] The pressure on Bynum to withdraw was great, and no candidate likes to face probable defeat.

Bynum was a leader of the Spaight faction, which stood solidly behind Jackson. He was an Old Republican not opposed to Van Buren. In at least four instances Branch had promised to support the administration, but for the record Bynum wished to receive an additional pledge. He wrote Branch a public letter offering to withdraw providing he could be convinced that Branch was still firm in Republican principles and would not oppose the administration. Bynum implied that he did not believe Branch's removal was caused by a "malign influence" and noted that his own enemies were encouraging Branch. He asserted he first must be satisfied as to the causes of Branch's dismissal.

Branch readily accepted Bynum's offer. He wrote that although he believed himself "unkindly treated" he had no "disposition to dilate on my wrongs before the American people." He met with a committee of Bynum's political friends, gave the required explanations, and denied that he had anything in common with the administration's enemies. Branch and the friends of Bynum issued a statement declaring that Jackson had done "nothing that can not be forgiven; . . . nothing im-

[33] Raleigh *Star,* May 26, June 30, 1831.
[34] Fayetteville *North Carolina Journal,* November 9, 1831.
[35] New Bern *Spectator,* June 4, 1831.
[36] Joseph D. White and others to John Branch, May 10, 1831, John Bishop and others to John Branch, May 1, 1831, John Branch to George Spruill, May 10, 1831, Raleigh *Star,* June 2, 1831, quoting Halifax *Minerva.*
[37] George Outlaw to John Branch, May 14, 1831, Raleigh *Star,* June 2, 1831; toast quoted in New Bern *Spectator,* July 8, 1831.

proper that did not result from his peculiar situation."[38] The committee announced Bynum's withdrawal and declared Branch merited their support.

The other congressional races were little affected by Branch's peculiar position. His political friends, Jesse Speight, Samuel Carson, Abraham Rencher, and Augustine Shepperd, were reelected without opposition. Three anti-Jackson congressmen, Lewis Williams, Daniel Barringer, and William Shepard, won reelection, and the latter was the only one who had serious competition. Gabriel Holmes had died, and his successor, Edward B. Dudley, did not seek reelection. A group calling themselves the friends of Jackson requested John Owen to be their candidate, but the disgusted ex-governor refused to run. The group then named James McKay who was elected without opposition. In the closest contest of the congressional race, ardent Jacksonian Lauchlin Bethune defeated Clay-partisan Edmund Deberry by thirty-seven votes. Popular Henry W. Connor and Old Republican Thomas Hall defeated anti-Jackson men by decisive majorities, and Robert Potter was reelected without opposition.[39] Immediately after the election Potter castrated two men whom he believed had been intimate with his wife. From the Hillsboro jail Potter resigned and Micajah Hawkins, an ardent Jacksonian, won a special election to fill the vacancy.[40]

As Robert Potter unsheathed his knife, John Branch raised his pen. Branch wrote Edward Freeman, editor of the Halifax *Minerva,* a public letter giving the "true reason" for his "dismissal." Branch declared it resulted from his refusal to accept social dictation. He told of receiving an ultimatum from the President commanding him to become friendly with the Eatons or resign. In Branch's public letter he asserted that the President's messenger, Richard M. Johnson, had ordered Branch to invite the Eatons to large parties. Branch explained that this was something no "man of honor" could do because Mrs. Eaton's reputation was such that no self-respecting person could associate with her. Branch wrote that only office-seeking politicians or "tools" of Martin Van Buren wishing to aid his selfish political aspirations would countenance an association.[41]

Branch had not finished. He wrote a public letter charging the Van Buren forces with driving the true friends of Jackson out of the administration. He began a controversy with William Berkeley Lewis,

[38] Jesse Bynum to John Branch, July 9, 1831, John Branch to Jesse Bynum July 12, 1831, "Report of the friends of Mr. Bynum," Tarboro *Free Press,* July 19, 26, 1831, quoting Halifax *Minerva.*

[39] Raleigh *Register,* March 24, April 2, May 12, August 11, September 1, 1831.

[40] William Watts Jones to Willie P. Mangum, August 30, 1831, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* I, 410; Robert Potter, "To the Citizens of Nash, Franklin, Granville and Warren," Raleigh *Star,* November 17, 1831; Raleigh *Register,* December 21, 1831.

[41] John Branch to Edward Freeman, August 22, 1831, New Bern *Spectator,* September 2, 1831, quoting Halifax *Minerva.*

and, in an attempt to prove Lewis guilty of hypocrisy, he published a letter in which the Tennessean had alluded to Mrs. Timberlake's notorious reputation.[42]

Eaton published his version of the quarrels and characterized Branch as an ungrateful wretch whose stupidity and conceit made him the "dupe of his own littleness of mind."[43] He emphasized Branch's hypocrisy and cited a letter dated January 29, 1830, in which the former Secretary of the Navy expressed friendship toward himself and his wife. Branch had publicly declared that his friendship with Eaton ended January 28, 1830, because on that date he found out that Eaton requested he be removed. The North Carolinian showed the editors of the *Star* the letter Eaton had cited and charged that the War Secretary had changed the date. Branch claimed the letter should have been dated January 27, 1830, the day before he learned that Eaton had requested his dismissal, and on January 27 Branch claimed that he had considered himself a friend of Eaton.[44] Most of the North Carolina editors sided with Branch, and they declared that Eaton's dishonesty in changing the date proved that he and other Van Buren partisans were capable of committing any crime known to man.[45]

In Washington the first alliance between the original anti-Jackson men and the Calhoun partisans was taking place. The alliance reached its climax when Calhoun cast the deciding vote against Van Buren's appointment as Minister to Great Britain. Both Bedford Brown and Willie P. Mangum made speeches defending Van Buren and were praised for their action.[46] Jesse Speight had taken a trip to North Carolina to gage public sentiment and had ended his political friendship with Branch. He now favored Van Buren as Jackson's successor, and jubilantly predicted the people would now demand Van Buren's elevation to the vice-presidency.[47]

Van Buren's enemies declared that their reason for opposing the nomination was because Van Buren, while Secretary of State, had given humiliating instructions to the minister to Great Britain. Senator John Forsyth of Georgia replied that one of the ousted cabinet ministers, loudest in his condemnation of Van Buren, had been present when Jackson and the cabinet approved the instructions. Branch took this as a personal allusion and denied that any such cabinet meeting had occurred.

[42] John Branch to Alexander Mebane and others, August 20, 1831, William Berkeley Lewis to John Branch, November 19, 1828, Tarboro *Free Press,* September 2, 1831, quoting Halifax *Minerva.*

[43] John H. Eaton,"Candid Appeal," New Bern *Spectator,* September 30, 1831.

[44] Raleigh *Star,* October 6, 1831.

[45] New Bern *Spectator,* October 14, 1831.

[46] George O. Askew to Willie P. Mangum, February 17, 1832, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* I, 485.

[47] Jesse Speight to Robert Strange, Washington, January 27, 1832, Robert Strange Letter, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Following the cabinet clash Eaton had called Branch many vile names and publicly issued a challenge, but the North Carolinian refused to fight. Branch now became very sensitive and wrote Forsyth to demand satisfaction. Forsyth apologized, but Branch published the letters to show he was willing to defend his honor.[48] Romulus Saunders and Jesse Speight published letters in the North Carolina press charging Branch with being present when the instructions were approved, and both denounced the ex-Secretary as an untruthful hypocrite. Branch again demanded satisfaction, but no duels occurred.[49]

After his dismissal, Branch and his allies desperately tried to build a new party in the state. They conceded the impossibility of defeating Jackson in 1832, but they formed a faction that they hoped would hold together until they could openly swing the state to John C. Calhoun.[50] Their immediate purpose was to defeat Van Buren.

There were many state leaders who aided Branch in these efforts. James Iredell was co-leader of the group, and most of the ex-Federalists who had formerly been Jackson supporters became members of Branch's party. William Polk, formerly the recognized leader of the Jackson forces, agreed to work with Branch to defeat Van Buren. Charles Fisher was with the Branch group heart and soul and worked to bring as many western Republicans into the group as possible. The greatest accession of strength came from independent Republicans. Samuel Carson, Edward B. Dudley, and John Owen followed the lead of the dismissed cabinet secretary. Even a few Old Republicans joined the Branch group. Willie P. Mangum was accepted as an ally, and he told people his support of Van Buren would depend on the role of the New Yorker's friends in the pending tariff act.[51] As far as leadership was concerned, the Branch-Iredell group was as strong as any in the state.

The new party had very strong support in the press. The *Star,* the *Western Carolinian,* the Fayetteville *Observer,* the Oxford *Examiner,* the Washington *Union,* and the Halifax *Minerva* were their allies, and the original anti-Jackson organs were encouraging them in every way.

[48] New Bern *Spectator,* February 17, 1832.

[49] Samuel Carson and Willie P. Mangum to John Branch, February 25, 1832, Romulus Saunders to Willie P. Mangum, March 31, 1832, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* I, 493, 522.

[50] William S. Ransom to Willie P. Mangum, February 8, 1832, *Willie P. Mangum papers,* I, 475; John Branch to James Iredell, Norfolk, March 31, 1832, James Iredell Papers, George Washington Flowers Collection, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina.

[51] James Iredell to Willie P. Mangum, February 4, 1832, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* I, 470-473; Robert D. W. Connor, ed., *Autobiography of Asa Biggs Including a Journal of a Trip from North Carolina to New York in 1832* (Raleigh, 1915), 52.

The activities of the party received wider coverage than those of any other group, but success depended on the attitude of the people.[52] Whether the people would react against the "malign influence" that had caused Branch's dismissal remained to be seen.

[52] Fayetteville *North Carolina Journal,* June 27, 1832.

CHAPTER VI

THE THREE PARTIES AND THE ELECTION OF 1832

> "There are no grounds for supposing that any disorganizing schemes of Governor Branch's friends, will have the least effect upon the people. The *people* are thorough going Jackson men, not mere *pretenders.*"
>
> Fayetteville *North Carolina Journal*[1]

> "As powerful as we admit the machinery and screws of party to be . . . we cannot believe it possible that the vote of this state will be given to Martin Van Buren. The people . . . begin to open their eyes to the ridiculous humbug which has been practiced on them by the Baltimore Convention."
>
> New Bern *Spectator*[2]

At the beginning of the campaign of 1832 John Branch had many followers and their group was the strongest political faction in the state. The partisans of John C. Calhoun were glad to accept Branch's leadership and try to keep Martin Van Buren from receiving the electoral votes of North Carolina. The outcry raised by Branch after the reorganization of President Jackson's cabinet had disrupted political factions. The Spaight faction, which in 1830 had been emerging as a party devoted to Jackson, was somewhat shattered, and Charles Fisher, the second most influential member of the group, was working to defeat Jackson's chosen running mate. About half of the members of the Caldwell-Alexander-Owen faction had not supported Jackson in 1828, and many of the members who had favored him were on the side of the enemies of his vice-presidential choice. There were Jackson supporters who were anxious to prove their loyalty to the President and his party by supporting the regular ticket, and there were men who honestly believed that Van Buren deserved the vice-presidential chair. Most of the original anti-Jackson men had lost none of their previous hostility to the President, but at the beginning of the campaign they showed little desire to form their own electoral ticket and were working with Branch and his allies to defeat Van Buren. In North Carolina during the election of 1832 most of the attention was concentrated on the contest for vice-president.

The Branch group soon found that merely to denounce Van Buren as

[1] May 9, 1832.
[2] June 15, 1832.

a "malign influence" was not enough to discredit him with the people. In March, Branch wrote his main lieutenant, James Iredell:

> Saunders and others are making great efforts to transfer the state to Van Buren. I hope that an opponent too [sic] him can be rallied and made emcient. Our strategy is to assert we "opposed the tariff and of course those who fastened the tariffs of '24 and '28 upon us."[3]

The Calhoun partisans and the anti-Jackson men followed the lead of Branch and characterized Van Buren as the "father of the tariff."[4] The Oxford *Examiner* declared that Van Buren's vote for the tariff was "a political sin for which . . . he has forever forfeited all claims to our support."[5] Van Buren's adherents defended his tariff vote by saying that he had followed the Republican doctrine of instructions, and they cited a speech showing that Van Buren desired to protect the consumer.[6] Yet on the tariff issue Van Buren was vulnerable.

As the cry against the "father of the tariff" increased, friends of Branch called meetings to demand the selection of an anti-tariff candidate for vice-president. The first call came from Branch's district and suggested that Branch was a suitable candidate to fill the office. Plans were made for a meeting in Halifax County to choose delegates to select an elector; but few of Branch's friends followed the suggestion and no statewide movement occurred.[7] Branch's followers met, but they recommended Philip Pendleton Barbour of Virginia as the candidate.[8]

Although the vice-presidential boom of John Branch had proved a fiasco, the call for an anti-tariff candidate was still strong, and James Iredell declared that any anti-tariff man could defeat Van Buren. William Montgomery, a staunch Jackson advocate, expressed his unwillingness to support Van Buren unless he was assured that the New Yorker would work for modification of the tariff. After it was noted that Van Buren's New York friends supported the tariff, even his former supporters, including Romulus Saunders, were ready to desert him. Yet such men were not ready to desert their party, and they would accept the party's nomination which was to be made at a convention in Baltimore.[9]

The strategy of the Branch group next turned to discrediting the

[3] John Branch to James Iredell, Norfolk, March 31, 1832, James Iredell Papers.
[4] New Bern *Spectator,* May 4, 1832.
[5] New Bern *Spectator,* April 20, 1832, quoting the Oxford *Examiner.*
[6] Romulus M. Saunders to Jackson Central Committee, Tarboro *Free Press,* June 2, 1832; "Young Hickory" in Tarboro *Free Press,* August 11, 1832.
[7] Martin Read to Willie P. Mangum, March 2, 1832, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* I, 500-501.
[8] Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* April 9, 1832, quoting Halifax *Minerva.*
[9] James Iredell to Willie P. Mangum, February 4, 1832, William Montgomery to Willie P. Mangum, June 6, 1832, Romulus Saunders to Willie P. Mangum, March 31, 1832, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* I, 473, 523-524, 550.

Baltimore Convention. The convention that had unanimously nominated Clay and Sergeant the previous December had been described by the *Western Carolinian* as a caucus of obscure men, but there had been little comment about the convention as a method of making nominations.[10] On May 2, a meeting was called in Halifax to name delegates to the Baltimore Convention. The Branch men attended the meeting; a quarrel arose and the meeting ended in a riot. Ex-Congressman Willis Alston led the anti-Van Buren forces to the house of the postmaster and they passed resolutions denouncing the Baltimore Convention. They urged the people to nominate delegates for a state meeting which was to be held in Raleigh on June 18. They personally endorsed Jackson and recommended Barbour as a suitable candidate for vice-president, but they insisted that only through a state meeting could a Republican nomination be made.[11]

The editors who cooperated with the Branch group created the illusion of a real grass roots movement. They filled their columns with reports of "large and respectable" crowds meeting and denouncing the Baltimore "caucus." Some of the meetings passed resolutions calling Van Buren a "political juggler," "father of the American system," a Federalist who opposed the War of 1812, and an abolitionist responsible for the anti-slavery provisions of the Missouri Compromise.[12] Inspired letters expressed disgust at people who wanted to meet at a caucus in Baltimore and tell the voters that they must elect Van Buren. There were occasional reports of "a few officeholders" meeting and promising to vote for the nominee of the Baltimore Convention.[13] Judging from the tone of their press, the Jackson-Barbour ticket would carry North Carolina at least ten to one.

On June 18, the state convention assembled. Delegates came from only eighteen counties, all in the eastern and north-central sections of the state. Edward B. Dudley called the meeting to order; James Iredell was president of the convention, Dudley, Alston, and William A. Blount were named vice-presidents, and Kenneth Rayner, Warren Winslow, and Charles Manly served as secretaries. The convention selected a central committee headed by William Polk. The convention adopted resolutions condemning Van Buren and the Baltimore "caucus" and praising Barbour for his anti-tariff stand. The following day the convention named Jackson and Barbour as candidates. Through the slow process of county and district meetings the Jackson-Barbour men selected their electors, and the ticket included such influential politicians as John Owen, William J. Alexander, Willis Alston, John Giles, and George Outlaw.[14]

[10] Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* December 12, 26, 1831.
[11] Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* May 7, 1832.
[12] New Bern *Spectator,* May 16, 1832.
[13] "Jackson Man," Tarboro *Free Press,* May 15, 22, 1832.
[14] Tarboro *Free Press,* July 3, October 7, 1832.

Many of the men who in the future would be recognized leaders of the Whig party were active in the Barbour movement. Even ardent Van Buren men had to admit that Barbour's nomination came from "a very respectable number of very respectable gentlemen."[15]

The Jackson-Van Buren press denounced the state convention. The *North Carolina Journal* printed a letter charging the members with being "Branch-Calhoun Nullifiers." The New Bern *Sentinel* declared that they could understand why the "Federalists" at Raleigh had not wanted Van Buren: he had the same principles as Jefferson, Madison, and Jackson, and Federalists had never wanted them. Even the national organ, the Washington *Globe,* noted the meeting and asked if "John Branch . . . really thought . . . [he] could upset Van Buren in North Carolina?"[16] The Greensboro *Patriot* answered, "Van Buren had upset himself . . . long ago."[17]

While the Branch group and their National Republican allies passed resolutions condemning the Baltimore Convention, the regulars were not idle. The independent Republicans who refused to follow the lead of John Branch now joined the remnants of the Spaight faction. Romulus Saunders emerged as leader of the new group; he was busy drawing up resolutions for various county meetings or writing letters concerning party strategy.[18] With him among Old Republican leaders were Richard Dobbs Spaight, Bedford Brown, Jesse Bynum and Joseph J. Daniel of Halifax. Among western Republicans Montfort Stokes was willing to use his influence to keep the West aligned with the regular wing of the party. Chief among independent Republicans in the fight against the third party movement was Jesse Speight, who was for Van Buren "tooth and toenail."[19] Owen Holmes and Robert Strange led strong factions in the commercial towns of Wilmington and Fayetteville, and they were active in Van Buren's cause. Judge Leonard Henderson, one of the few ex-Federalists to remain active in the Jackson-Van Buren party, and Robert Love allowed the Van Buren men to use their names. Charles Ramsey, editor of the recently established Raleigh *Constitutionalist,* became the leading editor in the group. The regulars were almost equal to the Branch group in leadership, and the people knew that they really were on the side of Andrew Jackson.

The regulars made their plans for attending the Baltimore Convention. In mid-January Saunders called a meeting of Wake County Jack-

[15] William H. Haywood, Jr., to Willie P. Mangum, June 22, 1832, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* I, 558.

[16] Fayetteville *North Carolina Journal,* July 14, 1832, quoting "A Citizen of Anson," New Bern *North Carolina Sentinel,* and Washington *Globe.*

[17] Greensboro *Patriot,* July 7, 1832.

[18] Romulus Saunders to Willie P. Mangum, March 18, 31, 1832, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* I, 513, 522-523.

[19] Jesse Speight to Robert Strange, Washington, January 27, 1832, Robert Strange Letter.

son men and the Jacksonians in the legislature. Governor Stokes presided and the meeting selected delegates to the national convention. A provision allowed public meetings to replace the delegates, or as Saunders frankly said, he could write the delegates and arrange for someone to take their place.[20] The Branch group denounced the arrangement, and soon the Jackson papers rushed to the defense.[21] They filled their columns with accounts of large public meetings selecting delegates to the Baltimore Convention and pledging themselves to support its nominee. They occasionally warned that division in the party would throw the election to the United States Senate and "abolitionist" John Sergeant might be elected.[22] Partisans wrote accounts of a few "old John Adams Federalists" getting together and selecting a delegate to the state convention.[23] In party management Saunders was proving himself the equal of John Branch.

Only five North Carolinians attended the convention: Saunders, Joseph H. Bryan, Bedford Brown, Owen Holmes, and William P. Williams. Saunders, the chairman of the delegation, and one other delegate cast their votes for Philip P. Barbour, and as the voting was by states North Carolina cast nine votes for Van Buren and six for Barbour. Van Buren won the nomination, receiving 208 votes to 49 for Barbour and 27 for Richard M. Johnson. Saunders reported the convention and portrayed Van Buren as the national candidate in contrast to Barbour and Johnson who were sectional candidates. He emphasized the division before the balloting and the wholehearted agreement afterwards.[24] Saunders had done his best to show that the convention was not a caucus to foist Van Buren on the American people, but the Branch group still characterized it as a "mockery" and a "farce."[25]

The Clay partisans were making little effort to enter the race, and many were working actively with the Branch group. The Jackson press joked about the "Clay-Adams Federalists" suddenly finding hidden virtues in the actions of Judge Barbour. Former Adams supporters William J. Alexander, James Mebane, and Isaac Croom appeared as electors on the Jackson-Barbour ticket.[26] The anti-Jackson editors continued to praise Henry Clay, but they emphasized the villainy of Van Buren and heaped scathing abuse on the Baltimore Convention. As late as September there was no anti-Jackson ticket, and only a few scattered counties had held meetings preparatory to selecting electors.

[20] Romulus M. Saunders to Willie P. Mangum, January 23, 1832, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* I, 463.
[21] Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* January 30, 1832.
[22] Fayetteville *North Carolina Journal,* May 27, 1832.
[23] "Fair Play" in Tarboro *Free Press,* May 22, 1832.
[24] Romulus M. Saunders to Jackson Central Committee, Tarboro *Free Press,* July 17, 1832.
[25] New Bern *Spectator,* June 1, 1832.
[26] Fayetteville *North Carolina Journal,* May 23, 1832; Tarboro *Free Press,* October 7, 1832.

Although the members of the Branch group and the partisans of Clay realized the value of cooperating with each other, events soon drove them apart. In February John Marshall rendered his decision in the case of Worcester vs. Georgia, and the original anti-Jackson men, following the line of the National Republican press, denounced Jackson for not enforcing it.[27] The Branch group was most emphatic in denouncing the Supreme Court for attempting to tell a sovereign state what it must do.[28] On the Indian question the two groups diverged widely, but the tentative alliance withstood the difference. The North Carolina National Republicans were not concerned enough over the poor Indians to break with their new allies.

The Clay partisans were strong supporters of the national bank, and in 1832 North Carolinians felt little animosity toward the institution. Dr. William Montgomery, a Jackson supporter, had introduced a resolution in the state legislature condemning the national bank, but he had withdrawn it because he ascertained that it would be defeated three to one. Even in Oxford, center of the anti-bank agitation of 1828-1829, meetings were held requesting that a branch of the national bank be established there.[29] William Gaston sent a memorial from the Bank of New Bern urging recharter of the national bank.[30] Three-fourths of "the most intelligent part of the community" favored the bank, stated an observer, and some conservative anti-Jackson men were ready to champion the institution.[31]

Willie P. Mangum was wavering between the regular Democrats and the Branch men, both anti-bank groups, but nevertheless regarded the bank as an "indispensible necessity." He felt it was "unfortunate" that the recharter act had been proposed during an election year, and he believed it would have passed had its advocates waited another year. He feared that the recharter act might "ultimately take the appearance of a trial of strength between General Jackson and the bank." The senator was a good enough judge of political sentiment to realize, "In that case the Bank will go down—For General Jackson's popularity is of *a sort* not to be slaken at present."[32]

Mangum would not run the risk of opposing Jackson and voted

[27] Raleigh *Register,* October 26, 1832; New Bern *Spectator,* April 13, 1832. For the political implications of the decision see William S. Hoffmann, "Andrew Jackson, State Rightist: The Case of the Georgia Indians," *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* (Nashville) XI (December, 1952), 329-345.

[28] Charlotte *Miners and Farmers Journal,* March 21, 1832, quoting Oxford *Examiner.*

[29] Spencer O'Brien to Willie P. Mangum, February 26, 1832, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* I, 494.

[30] William Gaston to the Honorable Members of the House of Representatives [New Bern, February, 1832] copy in William Gaston Papers.

[31] Henry Seawell to Willie P. Mangum, February 14, 1832, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* I, 484.

[32] Willie P. Mangum to William Gaston, January 19, 1832, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* I, 456.

against recharter. His colleague, Bedford Brown, did likewise, as did all six regular Jackson-Van Buren men in the House. Branch and two political friends, Samuel Carson and Abraham Rencher, also voted against recharter. Augustine Shepperd, a personal friend of Branch[33] but an independent, voted in favor of the bank. The three anti-Jackson men, Lewis Williams, Daniel Barringer, and William Shepard, voted for recharter. Except for Augustine Shepperd, every member of the North Carolina delegation voted along straight party lines.

In North Carolina Jackson's veto met a varying response. Most emphatic was George Howard, editor of the *Free Press,* who wrote at the top of his column, "Huzza! for Old Hickory!! Bank bill vetoed!"[34] Speaking for Old Republicans who were sincere in their adherence to strict construction, Weldon Edwards declared that the veto "would shed [more] luster on his [Jackson] fame than any act of his life."[35] Even the *North Carolina Journal,* a previous supporter of the bank, declared that Jackson's veto message convinced it that the bank was unconstitutional.[36] Very few Jackson-Van Buren men deserted the party over the bank issue.

The Branch men were divided over the issue. Edward J. Hale, editor of the Fayetteville *Observer,* bitterly denounced the veto and declared his open opposition to Jackson, but most of the group were like the *Western Carolinian.* It attacked Clay for supporting a "monied aristocracy" and urged the people to put down the bank.[37] Those of the Branch group who opposed the veto had one more charge against Jackson and Van Buren, but those who had supported it lost none of their previous hostility.

The original anti-Jackson men almost unanimously condemned Jackson's action. Continuing the policy of heaping odium on Van Buren, they first blamed the New Yorker for the veto. Lewis Williams declared that the veto was the work of Martin Van Buren, who had been prevailed upon by New York financiers. He wrote that without the national bank the whole South would be "tributary to New York."[38] The chant was taken up; according to the New Bern *Spectator* Jackson had "permitted Van Buren and the New York brokers to mislead his naturally defective judgment."[39] P. P. Barbour was an extreme enemy of the national bank, and it was absurd for advocates of the bank to sup-

[33] Augustine Shepperd to Charles Fisher, Washington, January 30, 1830, Fisher Papers.
[34] Tarboro *Free Press,* July 25, 1832.
[35] Weldon Edwards to Thomas Ruffin, July 16, 1832, *Thomas Ruffin Papers,* II, 61.
[36] Fayetteville *North Carolina Journal,* July 25, 1835.
[37] Fayetteville *North Carolina Journal,* July 25, 1832, quoting Fayetteville *Observer;* Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* January 9, June 18, 25, 1832.
[38] Lewis Williams to William Lenoir, Washington, January 12, 1832, Lenoir Family Papers.
[39] New Bern *Spectator,* July 13, 1832.

port Jackson and Barbour because Van Buren was an enemy of the institution. The National Republican press began to demand the formation of a Clay-Sergeant ticket, and some anti-Jackson politicians began taking steps to select National Republican electors.[40]

The event which completed the separation of the National Republicans and the Branch group was South Carolina's call for a nullification convention. The Van Buren press had been calling Barbour's supporters nullifiers since Branch's party had held its first public meeting. Although a majority of Barbour's supporters were not nullifiers, the leaders did not deny that they were partisans of Calhoun. They had chosen the issue of resistance to high tariff, and a resolution passed at the state convention said, "If you will resist the tariff when the crisis comes signify by voting for Mr. Barbour."[41] Iredell, so it was said, "goes the whole hog for nullification," and the *Western Carolinian* and the Halifax *Minerva* insisted that nullification doctrines were good Republican principles.[42] Some Van Buren men had previously advocated action which almost constituted nullification, but as the crisis drew near virtually all of them condemned the South Carolina doctrine. The Barbour party was not composed primarily of nullifiers, but almost all of the state's nullifiers were in the group.

With some of its number approving Calhoun's policy it was impossible for the group to escape condemnation. The *North Carolina Journal* stated that it had positive proof that Judge Barbour was a nullifier, and when the *Star* denied the charge the *Journal* remarked it had also denied that Calhoun had ever advocated nullification.[43] Some of Van Buren's enemies deserted the Barbour group. Willie P. Mangum denounced nullification and reluctantly voted for Van Buren. Edward J. Hale took his paper back into the Jackson-Van Buren camp and joined the cry that Barbour was a nullifier.[44] The *Carolina Watchman* said that it made no difference "whether Mr. Barbour is a nullifier or not, . . . that party . . . [is] supporting him," and the people should not "afford the disunionists even the semblance of a triumph. The cry in the mountains is Hurra for Jackson, Van Buren, and Union."[45]

Whether in the mountains or at sea "Hurra for . . . Union" seemed to be the cry. Some anti-Jackson men were such strong unionists that

[40] Raleigh *Register,* July 6, 1832.

[41] Fayetteville *North Carolina Journal,* May 9, 1832.

[42] William Haywood, Jr., to Willie P. Mangum, June 22, 1832, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* I, 558; Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* March 11, 1832; Charlotte *Miners and Farmers Journal,* December 15, 1832, quoting Halifax *Minerva.*

[43] Fayetteville *North Carolina Journal,* August 17, 24, 1832.

[44] Mangum's Speech, Orange County Union Meeting, Fayetteville *North Carolina Journal,* September 26, 1832; Mangum's Speech, Charlotte *Miners and Farmers Journal,* March 1, 1834; Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* October 1, 1832, quoting Fayetteville *Observer.*

[45] Fayetteville *North Carolina Journal,* August 22, 1832, quoting Salisbury *Carolina Watchman.*

they became active supporters of Jackson and Van Buren in order to discredit the Barbour movement. Especially in Rowan County, National Republicans joined the Jackson-Van Buren group, and one of their leaders, Thomas Polk, became an elector on the ticket. They established the *Carolina Watchman* to denounce nullification and its sympathizer, Charles Fisher.[46] Throughout the state most of the anti-Jackson men were unionist, and in September and October those who were not already active in the Jackson-Van Buren party formed their own ticket. Anti-nullification affirmations usually headed their list of resolutions. Typical of this was the address of an Asheboro meeting denouncing nullification as the "off spring of error and disappointed ambitions, whose baptism may be in blood."[47] The National Republicans usually condemned the spoils system, declared Democrats guilty of "rowdyism," and disapproved of the bank veto, but their chief emphasis was to vote for Clay to save the union.[48]

Both the Clay men and the Van Buren partisans concentrated their attack on the Barbour group. Charles R. Ramsey and others made a move which they believed would cause Barbour to announce his support of nullification.[49] On August 25 at Shocco Springs Resort they held a meeting and sent identical letters to Van Buren and Barbour asking their views on the protective system, internal improvements, the United States Bank, and nullification.[50] Barbour answered first. He declared that protection violated the "spirit of the constitution," and that the national bank and federal internal improvements were unconstitutional. He denied the right of nullification but affirmed the right of secession.[51] Some anti-Jackson men expressed horror at the avowal of secession, but most Democrats accepted it and attacked Barbour for the lesser crimes of dividing the Republican party and being willing to accept office from nullifiers.[52]

Van Buren's answer was almost as explicit. Enemies of Van Buren believed he had too much cunning to give a clear answer, but his own political friends urged him not to reply if he believed "an honest answer" would hurt him in New York.[53] Van Buren nevertheless wrote that he

[46] Charles Fisher to Willie P. Mangum, August 24, 1832, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* I, 571-572.

[47] Raleigh *Register,* October 8, 1832.

[48] New Bern *Spectator,* September 19, 1832.

[49] James Grant, acting editor of the *Constitutionalist,* to Martin Van Buren, August 30, 1832, Elizabeth G. McPherson, ed., "Unpublished Letters from North Carolinians to Martin Van Buren," *North Carolina Historical Review,* XV (January, 1938), 56. Hereinafter cited "Letters to Van Buren."

[50] Tarboro *Free Press,* September 11, 1832.

[51] Philip Pendleton Barbour to Joseph H. Bryan and others, September 9, 1832, Salisbury *Carolina Watchman,* October 13, 1832.

[52] Lewis Williams to Edmund Jones, Surry County, October 16, 1832, Lenoir Family Papers; Fayetteville *North Carolina Journal,* October 10, 17, 1832.

[53] James Grant to Martin Van Buren, August 30, 1832, McPherson, "Letters to Van Buren," 56; Lewis Williams to Edmund Jones, Surry County, October 16, 1832, Lenoir Family Papers.

favored encouraging domestic production providing the tariff would bear equally on all parts of the country. He opposed federal internal improvements, the national bank, and nullification.[54] Barbour, who was not running for office in New York, had gotten the better of the exchange.

Barbour's disavowal of nullification could not affect the election. The press repeated rumors that Barbour had withdrawn from the race.[55] On October 14 Barbour did withdraw from the race in Virginia and urge his friends to vote for Jackson and Van Buren electors.[56] Barbour's North Carolina organ noted that it was "evident Barbour intends it to apply to his own state alone; yet we cannot see how it can operate otherwise than as a total withdrawal."[57]

Less than thirty thousand voters went to the polls, about three-fifths of the number that had voted in 1828. Jackson and Van Buren received 21,007 votes or 71 per cent of the popular vote. Clay and Sergeant received 4,563 votes, and Barbour received 3,855.[58] The small number of votes for Barbour and the small total vote resulted in part from Barbour's Virginia withdrawal. The lateness of the National Republican forces to enter the contest in part accounted for the small number of votes Clay received. The potential voting strength of the anti-Van Buren forces was much greater than the 29 per cent of the total vote given to their two tickets.

The election of 1832 in North Carolina, as in the country, was a great personal victory for Andrew Jackson. In North Carolina he received 84½ per cent of the total vote and carried sixty-three of the sixty-four counties. With his chosen running mate he carried fifty-six counties, fifty-four of them by majorities. Clay and Sergeant won only two counties, Guilford and Iredell. Barbour carried six counties: Beaufort, Davidson, Halifax, Montgomery, and Rowan by majorities, and Cabarrus by a plurality. In Wilkes the combined vote of Barbour and Sergeant exceeded Van Buren's vote, and in Pitt it was exactly the same. Of the ten counties not giving majorities to Van Buren, seven were in the West. Charles Fisher, Samuel Carson, and the other western members of the Branch group had done their work more efficiently than their eastern brothers. The trend of the West toward Whiggery had already begun, but in 1832 it was very feeble.

In a sense the election was a victory of unionism over Southern nationalism. The two national tickets carried almost 87 per cent of the vote. Throughout the South the spirit of Southern nationalism had

[54] Martin Van Buren to Joseph H. Bryan and others, Tarboro *Free Press*, October 31, 1832.
[55] Salisbury *Carolina Watchman*, October 13, 1832.
[56] P. P. Barbour to Thomas W. Gilmer, October 14, 1832, Tarboro *Free Press*, November 6, 1832.
[57] Fayetteville *North Carolina Journal*, November 7, 1832, quoting Raleigh *Star*.
[58] Tarboro *Free Press*, November 27, 1832.

been rising, and in North Carolina it had been encouraged by the Branch-Iredell group in its effort to injure the northern candidate. Suddenly in the months before the election the fear of civil war arrested its progress, and a great surge of patriotic unionism took its place. This love of union had resulted in part from the deliberate efforts of politicians to build a force that would discredit the Barbour movement, but despite the motive, the nationalistic feeling was no less real. The cry, "Our Union, it must be preserved," was dominant in the land, and as long as it remained dominant the coalition of the enemies of Martin Van Buren could not again come together.

Because of the nullification crisis the election returns obscured the real significance of the campaign of 1832. Before the campaign so many men had claimed to be supporters of Jackson that nothing like a feeling of unity had existed between them. The campaign divided them, and John Branch and Romulus M. Saunders became leaders of the rival groups. Those who sincerely favored Jackson and wanted to act with the party which he led accepted the leadership of Saunders and supported the Jackson-Van Buren ticket, but those who supported Jackson only because it was politically expedient to do so at first tended to follow Branch and aid the Barbour movement. The original anti-Jackson men joined the Branch group in hurling cruel invectives at the Jackson-Van Buren partisans, and in the struggle Saunders and his associates drew together and emerged as a political party which would successfully weather future storms. Although in November the Branch group received a decisive defeat, during the hot summer months before South Carolina's call for a nullification convention they appeared to have great strength. They at first were supported by the original anti-Jackson men, and in their coalition they laid the foundation of a future political party which would eventually dominate the state. Although the nullification crisis temporarily disrupted the coalition, the Whig party was born in the political maneuvers of John Branch.

CHAPTER VII

NORTH CAROLINA POLITICIANS IN THE NATIONAL CRISIS OF 1833

> "We deeply regret the unfortunate and ill directed excitement which exists . . . and believe it to have been kindled in the breasts and fanned by the breath of a few ambitious and disaffected designing men. . . . These few factious leaders . . . are attempting to sacrifice the peace, the prosperity, and the lives of the citizens."
>
> Resolution of Brunswick Union Meetings[1]

> "The people begin to . . . see . . . that the contest must necessarily be settled by the sword. . . . The issue *will turne* upon the cause of the controversy;—*The unconstitutionality of the Tariff Laws*. . . . The President's proclamation contains . . . principles . . . which . . . strike at the . . . foundation of the republican principles of the States."
>
> Edward J. Hale[2]

The specter of nullification that proved so disastrous to John Branch's political party did not end with the election. Men and women continued to gather in court houses to solemnly declare their devotion to the Union and condemn the "mad policy" of John C. Calhoun.[3] For eighteen months political groups had been condemning nullification, but not until the autumn of 1832 did the people become deeply excited. In public meetings the people denounced nullification as a "species of treason" that would lead to "disunion and civil war," and they honestly felt that war was imminent.[4] Some meetings blamed John C. Calhoun and some blamed the tariff. All demanded that the union be preserved!

As the crisis drew near, fewer and fewer people were willing to approve the stand taken by South Carolina. Politicians who were believed to have favored nullification found occasions to denounce the policy, and a Person County wag commented, "We have only one nullifier and he is trying to work out of his former opinions."[5] Some politicians might have been trying to save their political reputations, but

[1] Fayetteville *North Carolina Journal,* December 19, 1832.
[2] Edward J. Hale to Willie P. Mangum, January 30, 1833, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* II, 15-16.
[3] New Bern *Spectator,* November 17, 1832.
[4] Charlotte *Miners and Farmers Journal,* October 27, 1832.
[5] Spivey McKissick to James K. Polk, January 18, 1833, McPherson, "Letters to James K. Polk," 76.

others, like the overwhelming mass of people, were carried away by an emotional force of unionism. Continuance of the union seemed more important than any abstract theory of government or any grievance over the tariff.

In November the state legislature convened. The members were aware of North Carolina's strategic position. Virginia officials sympathized with nullification, and legislators realized that if North Carolina should take its stand against coercion it would be more difficult for the central government to use force against the militant South Carolinians. Yet North Carolinians believed that a sympathetic attitude toward their southern neighbor would encourage South Carolina to put its plan into action and that it would lead to destruction of the union. Almost every legislator declared it was a time to forgo politics and to work together and save the country.[6] Yet before they could issue a statement on North Carolina's position during the crisis certain political decisions had to be made.

No party had a majority in the legislature. The voters had selected their legislators in August, before they had become extremely excited over nullification, and a large number of the Branch group had won elections. Samuel T. Sawyer, one of the few avowed nullifiers, sought election as speaker of the House, and he had the support of the Branch group. He secured almost enough pledges to win the position. Louis Henry, a Jackson-Van Buren leader from Fayetteville, was in the race, and most of the staunch unionists supported him. Henry won by only sixty-nine votes to fifty-two, but many who voted for Sawyer did not know that he was a nullifier.[7] William D. Moseley, a regular Democrat, was elected speaker of the Senate. The Jackson-Van Buren group was the strongest party.

The real cleavage between parties came with the election of state printer. On the first ballot eighty-nine legislators voted for Charles Ramsey, editor of the Jackson-Van Buren organ, while seventy-nine supported the editors of the *Star*. The National Republicans generally voted with the Branch group for the editors of the *Star,* but on the first ballot sixteen of them refused to support either candidate. On the third ballot Ramsey received enough of their votes to win the coveted post. The National Republicans held the balance of power.[8]

A hotly contested race developed for governor. Montfort Stokes had received a federal appointment and would not stand for reelection. The regulars supported Richard Dobbs Spaight; Branch had the support of his group; and the National Republicans at first supported Thomas Polk. During the election Polk had supported Van Buren, but

[6] Raleigh correspondent to New Bern *Spectator,* December 1, 1832.
[7] Tarboro *Free Press,* November 27, 1832; Charles Shepard to John H. Bryan, Raleigh, November 24, 1832, John H. Bryan Collection, Papers, III.
[8] Tarboro *Free Press,* December 4, 1832.

he had the utmost contempt for most Democratic leaders and at heart was a National Republican.[9] David L. Swain was the second choice of the National Republicans. Swain had approved the Adams administration and his closest political associates were William Gaston and Weston Gales, both ardent Nationals.[10] Publicly Swain had not allowed his position in national politics to be known, and he had the advantage over Polk in that he had not offended nullifiers and might eventually win their votes. Both Polk and Swain were champions of western interests and would receive support from about a dozen western Democrats.

In the legislature there were about ninety Democrats, fifty-five members of the Branch group, forty National Republicans, and ten independents. On the first ballot Spaight led with seventy-three votes, Branch came second with fifty-six votes, and Polk had fifty-one. Polk's friends withdrew his name, and Spaight's vote increased to ninety while Branch had but fifty-nine. On the third ballot Polk's friends nominated Swain and thirteen westerners deserted Spaight. Branch's vote remained almost constant, and after the fifth ballot his friends realized the hopelessness of his cause and withdrew his name. Most of Branch's supporters voted for Swain, and on the seventh ballot Swain was elected.[11] In their quest for office National Republicans and the Branch men could unite.

In his last public address, retiring Governor Montfort Stokes prayed that God would avert the calamity which threatened "our beloved union." He urged North Carolinians to "cling to the Union of States as now connected without adventuring upon hazardous experiments to change the terms of that connection."[12] Conservatives declared the appeal of the "vulgar old inebriate . . . had one good quality—brevity," but Stokes was speaking the feelings of the people.[13] They did not approve of the experiment of sending troops to coerce a state, and they emphatically opposed a state assuming the right to nullify laws, but above all they wanted to "cling to the union."

Many legislators wanted to pass a resolution that would let South Carolina and the general government know the views of the people. On November 22, James Martin, a National Republican, introduced a resolution condemning nullification and reaffirming the state's "sacred attachment" to the union. Two days later, Walter F. Leake, Jackson-Van

[9] Thomas Polk to William Polk, Salisbury, December 10, 1828, William Polk Papers.

[10] David L. Swain to George Swain, Raleigh, December 10, 1825, David L. Swain Correspondence, III.

[11] Tarboro *Free Press*, December 11, 1832.

[12] Montfort Stokes' Message to Legislature, Tarboro *Free Press*, December 4, 1832.

[13] Charles Shepard to John H. Bryan, Raleigh, November 24, 1832, John H. Bryan Collection, Papers, III.

Buren leader from Richmond County, proposed a resolution with a slightly different emphasis. It declared nullification "unconstitutional, violent, and of a revolutionary tendency," but it also declared that the protective tariff was equally unconstitutional.[14] A similar resolution added the warning, "We have not yet lost all confidence in the General Government."[15] Dr. John Potts, Democrat from Edgecombe County, wanted the legislature to declare that North Carolina "depreciates the resort to force" by either South Carolina or the federal government.[16] All the resolutions coincided in part with the attitude of most of the people, but to the members of the legislature these resolutions were not entirely satisfactory.

Three specific proposals were made for ending the crisis. Archibald Monk introduced a resolution instructing senators and requesting representatives to work for a general constitutional convention which would interpret all articles susceptible of misconception.[17] Richard Dobbs Spaight wished "respectfully" to ask South Carolina to postpone the ordinance of nullification until September, when "it is hoped that the tariff will be reduced to a revenue point."[18] The resolution passed the Senate by fifty votes to three, but it failed in the House.[19] Samuel Sawyer declared "nullification . . . a rightful remedy," and called on North Carolina to declare it would not "tamely submit," if the central government used coercive powers on a sister state. He requested the general government and South Carolina to stop all resistance and submit the "disputed power" to the "co states in convention."[20] Such a resolution followed Calhoun's theories of government, and neither the legislators nor the people of North Carolina approved. Sawyer's resolution was not even discussed. All three solutions avoided condemning South Carolina, and that was what the people demanded.

As resolution after resolution was introduced, the legislators decided to appoint a committee to draw up one resolution that all could approve. John D. Toomer of Fayetteville headed the committee and drew up its report. He emphasized the people's attachment to the constitution and the union. He admitted the right of revolution, but not for "light or transient causes." He declared that nullification was "revolutionary . . . subversive . . . and leads to a dissolution of the union." The resolution declared that the majority of the people of North Carolina believed the tariff was unconstitutional, and all the people condemned it as "impolitic, unjust, and oppressive."[21] It requested Congress to reduce the

[14] Tarboro *Free Press,* December 4, 1832.
[15] Tarboro *Free Press,* December 11, 1832.
[16] Tarboro *Free Press,* January 15, 1833.
[17] Tarboro *Free Press,* December 11, 1832.
[18] Tarboro *Free Press,* January 1, 1833.
[19] Tarboro *Free Press,* January 8, 1833.
[20] Raleigh *Register,* January 18, 1833.
[21] Tarboro *Free Press,* January 1, 8, 1833.

tariff immediately and "during a period of tranquility and peace" to call a constitutional convention. The resolution asked South Carolina not to put its revolutionary design into operation, and concluded by instructing senators and requesting representatives to use all constitutional means to bring about reconciliation. After a few days debate the resolution passed the House by ninety-eight votes to twenty-two, and the Senate by forty-eight votes to ten. Only one man protested against the instructions clause.[22] The legislators were almost five to one against rendering aid to South Carolina, but they did not sanction the use of force by the central government.

The resolution met a varying response among the people. The National Republicans approved but felt it erred on the side of leniency. The *Register* declared it did not sufficiently reprobate South Carolina leaders, and it denied that a majority of people believed the tariff unconstitutional.[23] The New Bern *Spectator* regretted that an amendment approving a force bill had been defeated.[24] The Branch group condemned the resolution. The *Western Carolinian* declared it was really an aid to the "tariffites," and legislator James Whitaker wrote the *Star* that it was too much like a "concealed dagger" to merit approval.[25]

Democrats had taken the major part in drawing up the resolution, but they were unhappy with the situation. The resolution condemned nullification, and to that they agreed; but the resolution neither denied nor confirmed the right of secession, and that was the crux of the issue. The South Carolina convention had said that after February 1, 1833, the tariff act was not binding on the citizens of its state and that any effort of the federal government to coerce the state or enforce the tariff acts would impel the people of South Carolina to secede from the union and organize a separate independent government.[26] The South Carolinians made military preparation and boldly talked of war should the federal government not acquiesce in nullification. Democrats noted the resolution said nothing on the real issue. The resolution did not say whether North Carolina would aid or hinder the federal government if fighting did occur.[27] The only solution they could see was for Congress to lower the tariff.

To accomplish this, Democrats would do more than cooperate in

[22] Tarboro *Free Press,* January 15, 22, 1833.
[23] New Bern *Spectator,* January 4, 1833, quoting the Raleigh *Register.*
[24] New Bern *Spectator,* January 18, 1833.
[25] Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* January 14, 1833; Raleigh *Star,* February 23, 1833.
[26] *An Ordinance to Nullify Certain Acts of the Congress of the United States, purporting to be laws laying duties and imposts on the importation of Foreign commodities,* quoted in Henry Steele Commager, *Documents of American History* (New York, 1946), 261-262.
[27] Tarboro *Free Press,* January 8, 1833.

drawing up resolutions. Jackson and other Democrats were supporting the Verplanck compromise tariff, a low tariff appealing to the South, but disliked by most Northerners. Dr. Thomas Hall wrote Van Buren a letter filled with gloomy forebodings, but he had one ray of hope. "If the Ver Plank bill passes—it will cure all."[28] William Haywood, Jr., was even blunter in his hint. He wrote Van Buren that he looked to him for "our next Jeffersonian victory," but unless New York Democrats worked for a compromise tariff the "madness of our Southern brethren" would result in the complete destruction of the "democratic ranks."[29]

Martin Van Buren strongly favored compromise and a lower tariff, but he was not running the government.[30] Andrew Jackson was! At first "Old Hickory" had seemed conciliatory, and in his annual message he had said nothing of using force to resist nullification and recommended tariff reductions. The Jackson-Van Buren men declared such a policy would save the union without bloodshed.[31] The National Republicans declared that the cool and moderate tone of the message indicated that Jackson did not realize how far South Carolina had gone.[32] They expressed the hope that Jackson would try to enforce the law.[33]

Jackson soon gave them assurance. On December 10 he issued a proclamation emphatically denying the right of nullification or secession and declaring the laws would be enforced. The paper virtually denied the existence of state sovereignty. In North Carolina the newspaper which formerly had been Jackson's severest critic declared the proclamation laid the "groundwork for the brightest page in our history and . . . deserved the approbation of every American." The editor, John I. Pasteur, frankly admitted, "The proclamation speaks entirely our sentiment."[34] Lewis Williams issued a circular and for the only time in his career approved an act of "Old Hickory."[35] The Clay-Adams men were wholeheartedly in favor of Jackson's proclamation.

The members of the Branch group were as emphatic in their condemnation as the National Republicans had been in their approval. The *Star* stated that only high tariff men and "consolidationists" could approve the document.[36] John Bailey charged that Jackson's "unconstitu-

[28] Thomas Hall to Martin Van Buren, January 2, 1833, McPherson, "Letters to Van Buren," 57.

[29] William Haywood, Jr., to Martin Van Buren, January 10, 1833, McPherson, "Letters to Van Buren," 58.

[30] Martin Van Buren, *Autobiography,* 540-544.

[31] Fayetteville *North Carolina Journal,* December 12, 1832.

[32] [Isaac T. Avery] to Thomas Lenoir, Swann Pond, January 12, 1833, Lenoir Family Papers.

[33] New Bern *Spectator,* December 14, 1832.

[34] New Bern *Spectator,* December 21, 1832.

[35] Lewis Williams, *To the Citizens of the Thirteenth Congressional District of North Carolina* (Washington, February 12, 1833), 4. Hereinafter cited *To the Citizens,* 1833.

[36] Raleigh *Star,* January 11, 1833.

tional measures" resulted solely from his antipathy to Calhoun.[37] Mangum, who was with the group in spirit, averred that the document was violent and dangerous in principle.[38]

The Democrats also found the principles dangerous, but they realized that this was a dangerous time! Jesse Speight wrote: "Politicians may quibble about abstract notions, but the people will stand by Andrew Jackson and save the Union." He admitted that it violated his basic concept of the union, but he declared that because "ambitious and disappointed politicians" wished to destroy the union patriots had no alternative but to accept the proclamation.[39] In other words, it was good policy, if wrong in principle. Nathaniel Macon declared, "I am still for union, no nullifier, nor an approver of the proclamation."[40] He believed a state could secede provided it paid its share of the public debt. Yet in spite of his strong feeling for state rights he did not break with the administration. Macon claimed that notwithstanding the gross error contained in the proclamation, the administration came nearer following the true interpretation of the constitution than did the opposition.[41] As the controversy drew to a close he entered a friendly argument with Jackson concerning the proclamation and the force bill. Jackson noted that Macon had voted for the "bloody bill" in 1808, a bill empowering the federal government to enforce the embargo act despite the objections of New England. Macon admitted that at the time of the embargo he and Jefferson might "have done wrong in the very hot time in which we acted."[42] He excused Jackson's measures on the same grounds.

The crisis reached its climax when Jackson demanded a force bill. National Republicans raised their voices in approval, but Branch men condemned the "bloody bill" with great vigor.[43] Few Jackson-Van Buren men in North Carolina approved, and the party organ warned, "Blood can never cement our union."[44] In the Senate Bedford Brown apologized for going against the administration but declared he had to follow the dictates of his heart and the instructions of the legislature. Both required him to work for a peaceful solution, and he feared the

[37] John Bailey to Willie P. Mangum, December 25, 1832, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* I, 591.
[38] Willie P. Mangum to Charity Mangum, December 15, 1832, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* I, 589.
[39] Jesse Speight's Circular, Tarboro *Free Press,* January 22, 1833.
[40] Nathaniel Macon to Martin Van Buren, March 2, 1833, McPherson, "Letters to Van Buren," 59.
[41] Nathaniel Macon to Samuel Carson, February 12, 1833, Raleigh *Register,* August 13, 1833.
[42] Nathaniel Macon to Andrew Jackson, August 26, September 25, 1833, Andrew Jackson to Nathaniel Macon, September 2, 1833, *Jackson Correspondence,* V, 171, 178, 208-209.
[43] New Bern *Spectator,* February 1, 1833; Raleigh *Star,* January 25, February 1, 8, 1833.
[44] Tarboro *Free Press,* January 1, 1833, quoting Raleigh *Constitutionalist.*

force bill would make war more likely. He compared the South Carolina nullification convention to the Hartford convention and denounced nullification as unsound "Federalist" doctrine. Yet he claimed that the policy of coercion was very dangerous and similar to the mistake made by George III and Lord North at the beginning of the Revolution.[45] Mangum also spoke against the bill. In the House two Van Buren men, Henry W. Connor and Thomas Hall, voted with two of Branch's faction, Abraham Rencher and Samuel Carson, against the force bill, while four Van Buren men voted with Augustine H. Shepperd and the three anti-Jackson congressmen in favor of the measure.[46]

Andrew Jackson had lost all interest in securing passage of Verplanck's compromise tariff and was determined to force the "bloody bill" through Congress. Henry Clay saw his opportunity; he promulgated his own compromise, which John C. Calhoun accepted. Clay introduced his measure before the Senate voted on the force bill. Many Northerners opposed the compromise tariff, but favored the force bill. Most southern senators opposed the force bill but approved the compromise tariff. An agreement was made whereby Southerners, including Brown and Mangum, did not vote on the force bill, and many Northerners did not vote on the compromise tariff. Both measures passed. Although Verplanck's tariff was much more favorable to the South, Calhoun had preferred to let Henry Clay receive credit for averting civil war.

No member of the North Carolina delegation opposed the compromise tariff, and it was widely approved at home. "The long agony is over! And the Republic Safe!" declared a Democratic editor. He even admitted that Henry Clay deserved much credit.[47] The New Bern *Spectator,* a National Republican organ, regretted that "traitors" were not to be hung and predicted, "Now there will be no more nullification for a month or two." In the next edition the editor heaped abundant praise on Clay for saving the union and returned to his pre-nullification policy of denouncing Jackson.[48] The National Republican press was filled with letters calling Clay the savior of the nation.[49] Its party gained much popularity because of Clay's compromise.

The Branch men tried to take credit for the lower tariff. The *Western Carolinian* gave the nullifiers full credit for the tariff reductions, and declared that the "proclamation men" had only wanted the blood of their southern brother.[50] Abraham Rencher issued a circular declaring the protective system had received a blow from which it would never recover.[51] John Branch gave this toast: "The compromise tariff of 1833

[45] Bedford Brown's Speech, Raleigh *Star,* March 1, 1833.
[46] Tarboro *Free Press,* March 8, 1833.
[47] Tarboro *Free Press,* March 15, 1833.
[48] New Bern *Spectator,* March 8, 15, 1833.
[49] "Subscriber" in Raleigh *Register,* April 9, 1833.
[50] Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* March 11, 1833.
[51] Rencher's Circular, Raleigh *Star,* May 10, 1833.

—conceived and consummated by opposing patriots."[52] The former cabinet member hoped that he could again unite the North Carolina followers of Henry Clay and John C. Calhoun, but in the early months of 1833 many of the men who appreciated Clay's patriotism had nothing but contempt for Calhoun, the man who had brought the country to the brink of war.

During the crisis scurrilous name calling frequently characterized the pronouncements of both unionists and nullification sympathizers. In Rowan County the abuse was especially bitter and almost culminated in a duel between the rival leaders. Unionist leader David Caldwell delivered a challenge from Richmond Pearson to Charles Fisher, but Fisher would not receive the message. Caldwell then personally challenged Fisher; this challenge Fisher accepted. Caldwell practiced pistol shooting, but Fisher had the right to select weapons and ludicrously chose large broadswords. Caldwell was elderly and stout, and he could barely lift the heavy weapon. He was incapable of fighting with it and, through his seconds, demanded that other weapons be chosen. Fisher refused and instead of fighting a duel the seconds of the two men published handbills charging their friend's rival with cowardliness.[53] The people of the state got a laugh from the incident, and an observer noted that the actions of the two men were more "apt to raise the price of ink than powder."[54]

Nullifier was a term of contempt in North Carolina, and in 1833 the men who were publicly associated with it had a difficult time in the battle for political survival. The anti-nullification feeling was still strong at the time of the 1833 congressional elections. Samuel Carson, an avowed nullifier, faced opposition from National Republican James Graham and Democrat David Newland. Condemnation for being a nullifier coupled with Graham's personal popularity was too much for the once popular Carson to overcome. Even the publication of a letter from Nathaniel Macon, in which the ex-senator recognized the right of secession, failed to save Carson from defeat.[55] Graham received 3,272 votes, Carson received 2,402 votes, and Newland received 2,183. Carson's defeat resulted from his sympathy for nullification.

John Branch faced similar prospects. He had never quite advocated nullification but was an extreme advocate of state sovereignty and a

[52] Tarboro *Free Press,* July 13, 1833.

[53] Archibald Henderson, "Unable to Agree on Duel Weapons, Caldwell and Fisher Wrote It Out," in [J. G. deRoulhac] Hamilton, Collector, Scrapbook, 157. A collection of newspaper clippings in the North Carolina Room of the University of North Carolina Library. The article contains the letters of the participants and their seconds.

[54] James Graham to W. A. Graham, Rutherfordton, August 12, 1833, W. A. Graham Papers, University of North Carolina.

[55] Nathaniel Macon to Samuel Carson, February 12, 1833, Raleigh *Register,* August 13, 1833.

partisan of Calhoun. He decided not to make the race, and his political friend Andrew Joyner announced his candidacy. Regular Democrat Jesse Bynum entered the race and received 2,198 votes while only 1,476 people voted for Joyner. The other two members of the Branch group were elected without opposition, but Augustine Shepperd had strongly opposed nullification and Abraham Rencher represented the one district where there was sizable nullification sentiment.[56] Branch's party suffered because of its association with the South Carolina doctrine, but it still retained the balance of power in the state delegation.

The National Republicans gained strength and increased their contingent in Congress to five. Lewis Williams defeated Jackson supporter Samuel King by a large majority. Daniel Barringer was opposed by John G. A. Williamson, a Jackson man and an outspoken enemy of the United States Bank. Barringer won by a slight majority receiving 2,497 votes, sixty-one votes more than his opponent. William B. Shepard was elected without opposition. In the Fayetteville district Edmund Deberry again opposed Lauchlin Bethune. Deberry received 3,268 votes and Bethune 3,231. The national bank was popular in the district, and Bethune's opposition to recharter probably caused his defeat. Deberry won the election by thirty-seven votes, exactly the same margin by which Bethune had won the previous election.[57] The National Republicans had only one less congressman than the regular Democrats.

Six regular Democrats won elections. Henry W. Connor, Jesse Speight, and Dr. Thomas Hall were reelected without opposition. James McKay was opposed by Louis Dishongh, whose chief claim to fame was authorship of a bill to reduce judges' salaries.[58] McKay won the election and received 2,570 votes while Dishongh received 2,056 votes. Micajah Hawkins faced two strong competitors, but he received a 177-vote plurality to retain his seat.[59] Bynum's victory balanced Bethune's defeat; the Democrats had held their own.

The most significant influence that the nullification crisis had on North Carolina politics was that it made some of the members of the Branch group open and avowed enemies of the administration. Their association with nullification had weakened them, but they were still powerful in state politics. Henry Clay's action in the crisis made him popular in the state, and politicians who had favored him but refused to take a stand were now proud to be known as his supporters. The Jackson-Van Buren group was composed of moderate men and few approved Jackson's militant stand. Yet very few of them broke with the administration because of differences which arose during the crisis. As

[56] Raleigh *Register,* August 20, 1833.
[57] William K. Ruffin to Thomas Ruffin, July 7, 1833, *Thomas Ruffin Papers,* II, 80; Raleigh *Register,* August 13, 20, 1833; Tarboro *Free Press,* August 24, 1833.
[58] Tarboro *Free Press,* January 1, 1833.
[59] Raleigh *Register,* August 20, 27, 1833.

Macon said when voicing objections to the force bill, "It is the great error of the administration, which, except that, has been satisfactory in a high degree."[60]

In neither state nor national politics did the nullification crisis cause major shifts in political allegiances. The Old Republicans who believed in limited central authority conceded the right of the central government to levy a tariff. That right was specifically delegated to the central government by the constitution, and Jackson simply wanted to enforce a constitutional law. Admittedly in his anti-nullification proclamation and his demand for a force bill Jackson had talked in nationalistic terms and asked for Congress to grant him the power to coerce a state, a power not specifically delegated to the central government. Yet with the exception of these two events during the crisis of 1833, Andrew Jackson acted in a manner that would cause no objections from a true believer in the state's rights philosophy. The true state's righters, like Brown and Macon, did not break with "Old Hickory." The old Federalists and the Republicans who favored nationalistic policies admired Jackson during the crisis, but none deserted their party to become partisans of the president.

The nullifiers and their sympathizers were not champions of limited federal government and state's rights. Neither were they supporters of the majority of Jackson's policies. They did not desert Jackson because of the force bill; they had always given their first loyalty to Calhoun, and the South Carolinian had openly broken with Jackson months before the nullification crisis reached its height. The nullification controversy merely brought into dramatic focus the differences of the three parties already in existence, the believers in nationalism, the believers in limited federal government, and the followers of Calhoun who wanted to rule the federal government or disrupt it.

Jackson's militant action during the nullification crisis purged the party of its opportunist wing. The Jackson party ceased to be a hodge podge of all who had opposed the policies of Adams and Clay. After the elimination of the Calhoun faction the remainder of the party was composed in large measure of true believers in the Jeffersonian concept of limited federal authority. The political friends of Calhoun would have to find some place else to go. Andrew Jackson not only saved the Union, he purified his party.

[60] Nathaniel Macon to Samuel Carson, February 12, 1833, Raleigh *Register*, August 13, 1833.

CHAPTER VIII

THE TWO-PARTY SYSTEM AND THE DOUBLE-EDGED SWORD CALLED INSTRUCTIONS

> "We behold angry, vindictive and vituperative partisanship. Every question is converted into one of rancorous party feeling and the only test of merit acknowledged by 'the party' is pure unadulterated and whole-hog Jacksonism."
>
> Raleigh *Register*[1]

> "Instructions to Mr. Mangum . . . have now passed. . . . The rights of the people of North Carolina have been vindicated. . . . Most nobly have the democratic members defended the principles of the Republican party . . . and triumphed over the power and corruption of the moneyed aristocracy."
>
> Tarboro *Free Press*[2]

After the nullification crisis had ended North Carolinians tended to lose interest in national politics. For about a year state issues seemed more vital, but as yet state issues were not fought along party lines. David Swain, William Gaston, William Haywood, and other political leaders felt it was more important to work for a state wide program of railroad development than to divide over national issues. Most politicians advocated railroad development in general, and they usually insisted that a railroad should pass through their own community. They gathered in county, district, and state conventions, and in an attempt to please all sections of the state the leaders of the movement set a very high goal. The desire for internal improvements was linked with the unabated demand for constitutional revision. Hopes were very high, but the 1833 legislature failed to appropriate any money for internal improvements. For a few months people spoke resentfully of the legislature because of its failure to act, and they expressed a renewed determination to secure a state railroad system, but the high hopes were soon forgotten, and the spirit which had made an ambitious program seem possible gradually waned.[3]

A sharp difference of opinion over state banking policy continued to play its part in the divisions of the state. The legislature of 1832-1833 chartered the Bank of North Carolina with a capitalization of $2,000,000, one-half of which was to be subscribed by the state and the

[1] November 25, 1834. [2] January 9, 1835.
[3] Raleigh *Register,* January 21, February 4, 1834; Cecil K. Brown, *A State Movement in Railroad Development,* 1-22.

other half by individuals. The bank was to be managed by directors appointed by the legislature.[4] Very few people purchased stock, and the bank was never organized.[5] The 1833-1834 legislature chartered the bank of the State of North Carolina allowing capitalists to subscribe three-fifths of the stock and to select three-fifths of the directors, and in May, 1834, it began operations. The 1833-1834 legislature also re-chartered the Cape Fear Bank and gave new charters to private banks in New Bern and Edenton.[6]

While North Carolinians were debating banking, internal improvements, and other state issues, Andrew Jackson was making another of his major decisions. In March of 1833 he called a cabinet meeting to discuss the safety of the government's deposits in the United States Bank, and six months and two cabinet changes later Jackson's acting Secretary of the Treasury, Roger B. Taney, ordered future deposits placed in state banks. There was some outcry in North Carolina. The *Register,* like all National Republican journals, received the news with indignation and called on the public to demand the restoration of the deposits to the national bank.[7] The *Star,* organ of the nullification sympathizers, had been trying to pose as the President's friend since the end of the nullification crisis, but it again shifted its course. Its editor cried out against the danger of placing in the hands of the executive "both the sword and the purse."[8] The *Carolina Watchman,* organ of the National Republicans who had favored Jackson and Van Buren as a lesser evil than the nullifiers, condemned the removals and praised the national bank.[9] All the open or secret enemies of Jackson and Van Buren were expressing similar views.

To the people, at first the removals seemed less important than the various state issues, and it took the administration's enemies months to arouse much feeling against the policy. In the General Assembly of December, 1833 questions concerning the national bank received only incidental attention. A resolution instructing the senators to use their influence in favor of the bank failed as did one endorsing Jackson's veto of the recharter bill. In 1833 the legislators showed a determination to give resolutions concerning national issues the "go by" and devote their time to state affairs.[10]

Yet due to the constant emphasis of the press, by the Spring of 1834 people were forgetting state issues to concentrate their attenion on the

[4] *Acts of the General Assembly of the State of North Carolina at the Session of 1832-1833* (Raleigh, 1833), 3-8.

[5] David L. Swain's Message to the Legislature, Raleigh *Star,* November 22, 1833.

[6] *Acts Passed by the General Assembly of the State of North Carolina at the Session of 1833-1834,* (Raleigh, 1834), 3-28; Raleigh *Star,* May 27, 1834.

[7] Raleigh *Register,* October 1, 1833.

[8] Raleigh *Star,* September 27, 1833.

[9] Raleigh *Register,* October 22, 1833, quoting Salisbury *Carolina Watchman.*

[10] Raleigh *Register,* December 17, 1833, January 7, 1834.

war between Andrew Jackson and the national bank. Nicholas Biddle, president of the United States Bank, required branch banks to restrict business and curtail loans. In some areas a panic followed, and for months the newspapers published by anti-Jackson editors contained little except constant charges that the panic resulted from Jackson's arrogant attitude in refusing to restore the deposits.[11] In North Carolina farm prices increased slightly, business remained good, and no panic existed. Democrats noticed that the removals caused distress only to stockholders of the national bank.[12] Bedford Brown reported to Van Buren that "the failure of the bank . . . to produce mischief and widespread ruin has become a standing topic of derision," and the people were enjoying "more solid and substantial prosperity" than at any time in recent years.[13] On the Senate floor Brown declared:

> Every day the accents of distress . . . sounded here. . . . Different kinds of distress prevail. . . . Not among the least distressed was that class of politician . . . distressed because their opponents were *in* power and they themselves were *out* of power.[14]

During 1834 a fierce debate raged in North Carolina over the removals. Some anti-Jackson editors were so actively trying to arouse resentment against the President's policy that they ceased to print editorials on the needs of the state. Politicians were so busily arranging for public meetings or grand juries to condemn or approve the removals that they forgot to keep themselves publicized as advocates of state improvements or western interests.[15] The regular Democrats had fewer papers working in their behalf, so the tone of the press was predominantly against removals. In February, 1834, Abraham Rencher wrote Charles Fisher and implied that if the issue were kept before the public long enough it would "Prostrate" Van Buren.[16]

The most important state political leader who openly deserted Jackson was Willie P. Mangum. In February, 1834, he joined the anti-Jackson party and became its most active leader. Mangum had great respect for the financial leaders of North Carolina, and he personally favored the United States bank. He had sympathized with South Caro-

[11] Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* March 22, 1834.

[12] Nathaniel Macon to Martin Van Buren, May 24, 1834, McPherson, "Letters to Van Buren," 61.

[13] Bedford Brown to Martin Van Buren, September 24, 1834, William K. Boyd, ed., "Selections from the Correspondence of Bedford Brown," Trinity College Historical Society *Historical Papers* (Durham) VI (1926), 88.

[14] Bedford Brown's Speech, Raleigh *Register,* January 21, 1835.

[15] Orange County meeting, Hillsboro *Recorder,* July 4, 1834; Resolutions of grand juries from Rowan (in which Charles Fisher was foreman) and from Davidson, Cabarrus and Iredell counties, Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* April 19, May 3, 1834.

[16] Abraham Rencher to Charles Fisher, Washington, February 11, 1834, Fisher Papers.

lina during the nullification crisis, and he had great admiration for John C. Calhoun.[17] As far as his feelings and principles were concerned, Mangum should have opposed Andrew Jackson.

But Willie P. Mangum's career had been marked by a careful regard for expediency. Believing the national bank "an indispensible necessity" he could twice vote against recharter; believing that distribution of the proceeds from public lands would "be a sort of make-weight in aid of the continuance of the tariff," and being an extremely ardent enemy of the tariff, he could nevertheless ask to be instructed in favor of distribution.[18] During 1833 Mangum had generally cooperated with the enemies of the administration, but he had not publicly broken with Jackson, and this half-way support was not enough to satisfy the anti-Jackson men. Mangum's brother, reported that "the power of money is in the ascendant," and that David L. Swain would defeat Bedford Brown for the Senate. Priestley Mangum warned, "Then it will not be long before . . . the same party [that supported Swain] will . . . elect Gov^{r} Owen over you."[19] Willie P. Mangum received many letters from constituents, practically all informing him that the removal was very unpopular.[20] The Whig party seemed to be the party of the future, and expediency combined with principle to cause Willie P. Mangum to repudiate Jackson and join the Whigs.

In February and March, 1834, the bank fight reached the zenith of its fury. In the House of Representatives all six regular Democrats from North Carolina voted with the majority to approve removals, while the two Branch men and the five National Republicans voted their disapproval of transferring the deposits.[21] The most vehement debate came in the Senate. Henry Clay had introduced a resolution to censure Jackson for his action. Willie P. Mangum supported Clay's measure, and in a philippic against the administration he declared that all men, except those who were tools of Van Buren, regarded removal as the worst lawlessness in their memory. Bedford Brown replied to his colleague, accusing him of hypocrisy, of shedding his principles, of being a defender of the national bank, and of misrepresenting the people of North Carolina.[22] The Senate passed a resolution censuring the President, and Jackson answered with a note protesting the Senate's action.

This action set off another verbal battle in the state press. The *Western Carolinian* called Jackson's threat to send a message to "over-

[17] Frederick Nash to Willie P. Mangum, January 23, 1833, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* II, 11.

[18] Willie P. Mangum to William Gaston, January 19, 1832, Willie P. Mangum to David L. Swain, December 22, 1833, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* I, 456, II, 54.

[19] Priestley Mangum to Willie P. Mangum, February 20, 1834, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* II, 89.

[20] Spencer O'Brien to Willie P. Mangum, February 17, 1834, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* II, 86.

[21] Raleigh *Register,* April 8, 1834.

[22] Willie P. Mangum's Speech, Bedford Brown's Speech, Raleigh *Register,* March 18, 1834.

awe the Senate" an attempt to establish dictatorial rule, and compared Jackson's protest to a monarch's message from the throne.[23] The *Register* regarded the protest as a fresh example of "executive usurpation" and a step toward assuming unlimited power.[24] The *Miners and Farmers Journal,* a pro-bank paper that was neutral on other issues, declared that the protest would destroy the constitution.[25]

The Jackson press was very weak, but Romulus Saunders intended to remedy the situation. The *Constitutionalist* had gone bankrupt in 1833, and the attempt of Joseph Hinton to establish the *Statesman* in its place had ended in failure.[26] In the summer of 1834 Saunders bought the press of the defunct *Constitutionalist.*[27] He induced Philo White, a former editor of the *Western Carolinian* but more recently naval agent at Valparaiso, to become editor of the new paper. In November White's *North Carolina Standard* became the Democratic organ and one of the most powerful papers in the state.

In their common attack on removals, the National Republicans, the Branch men, and a few Democrats who were friends of the bank emerged as the Whig party. At first some National Republicans objected to cooperating with nullifiers, and the feeling was reciprocated. James Graham commented that he was in "bad company" now that the nullifiers were opposing removals.[28] At first some nullifiers scorned the National Republican party for its magnanimity in "letting nullifiers cooperate with *them* . . . so long as . . . the nullifiers will be satisfied to play second fiddle to their local leader of the band."[29] "Dick Short," the *Western Carolinian*'s counterpart of Major Jack Downing, attacked the "Proclamation Whigs." He declared:

> I'd rather see a thousand Banks deprived of deposits, than one state threatened with the sword, . . . its my opinion if we were to put one of this mixed breed in the place of a whole-hog [Jackson] man, it would be swapping the [devil] for a witch.[30]

In spite of occasional friction, the two groups cooperated in their attack on the common enemy. In December National Republicans issued a call for the formation of "State Right Societies of Whig Associations."[31] The National Republicans would speak the language of state rights if the nullifiers would champion their policies. In the leadership of the new party the two groups were about equally balanced.

[23] Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* March 29, May 17, 1834.
[24] Raleigh *Register,* April 29, 1834.
[25] Charlotte *Miners and Farmers Journal,* May 3, 1834.
[26] Tarboro *Free Press,* May 18, 1834; Raleigh *Register,* December 14, 1833.
[27] Hillsboro *Recorder,* July 30, 1834.
[28] James Graham to W. A. Graham, Washington, January 2, 1834, W. A. Graham Papers, University of North Carolina.
[29] Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* October 11, 1834.
[30] "Dick Short" in Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* November 1, 1834.
[31] "Sidney" in Raleigh *Register,* December 23, 1834.

The new party made use of the doctrine of instructions to embarrass its political enemies. Whig politicians arranged for public meetings to instruct senators and to request congressmen to restore the deposits.[32] Henry W. Connor replied to one such petition with a respectful answer. He declared that he would resign if instructed by a majority of his district to carry out some act which he could not approve, but he denied that the group instructing him constituted a majority. The *Miners and Farmers Journal* arraigned Connor for refusing to obey or resign and declared his letter constituted a denial of the right of instruction.[33]

Most of the Whig resolutions were designed to embarrass Senator Bedford Brown. On the days allotted for introducing petitions in the Senate, Willie P. Mangum would respectfully introduce anti-removal petitions and call them instructions from the people of North Carolina. On February 11, 1834, he introduced one such petition from Burke County. Brown stated that he would obey instructions or resign. Brown asked for the petition to be read, and then he declared that the resolution came from members of the opposite political party and did not represent the attitude of the state. Mangum again called up the "instructions," and Georgia Senator John Forsyth expressed disgust at the "miserable petition." Brown declared it had been the work of "a partisan collection of bank men in a pot house . . . led by a disappointed politician." Taking this as an allusion to Samuel Carson, Mangum praised the defeated congressman. Burke County Whigs protested Brown's language, and Whig editors averred that Brown had called his fellow citizens "pot house politicians" and the voice of his constituents "miserable petitions."[34] They denounced him for not resigning or obeying instructions.

Senator Mangum thought he had found another use for the doctrine of instruction. Henry Clay had previously introduced a bill to distribute the proceeds from western land sales among the states. The bill passed, but Jackson vetoed the act. Mangum had twice voted against it. In his new alliance he thought distribution would be a good measure on which anti-Jackson men could unite. Yet since he was on record against the bill, he realized that he would be accused of deserting his principles should he reverse himself and support distribution. He urged Governor Swain to arrange for the legislature to send him instructions so he could

[32] Salisbury and Mocksville meetings, Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* March 22, 29, 1834, William S. Hoffmann, "Willie P. Mangum and the Whig Revival of the Doctrine of Instructions," *Journal of Southern History* (Lexington) XXII (August, 1956), 206-08.

[33] *Miners and Farmers Journal,* April 19, 1834.

[34] Charlotte *Miners and Farmers Journal,* March 1, 1834; Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* March 8, 1834; Raleigh *Register,* February 25, March 18, April 15, 1834; Copy of Burke County Resolutions, March 27, 1834, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* II, 127-130.

support distribution at the expressed will of the people.[35] Swain tried hard to get such resolutions but was unable to make the arrangements.

At the height of the removal controversy the voters of the state went to the polls to elect legislators. Both parties talked of the election serving to instruct the senators, and most of the candidates took a clear stand. They either opposed recharter of the national bank, supported the administration, and favored the reelection of Bedford Brown, or they condemned removals and opposed Brown's reelection.[36] Although candidates had previously asked for election because they were friends of Jackson, the election of 1834 was the first in the history of the state when people voted for legislators primarily because of their stand on national politics. The voting was close and both parties claimed victory.[37] Careful observers noted that a few independent western legislators who were inclined to support Brown and the administration held the balance of power.[38]

Whig leaders had decided that David L. Swain had the best chance to defeat Brown. Swain's personal popularity was great, and several Whig leaders ascertained that this, coupled with his stand for state internal improvements and western interests, would lead the independent Westerners to support him instead of Brown.[39] Swain feared that John Branch was in his way, but John Owen and others arranged it so that Swain would be the Whig candidate for senator and Branch the candidate for governor.[40]

Only one anti-Jackson leader was unwilling to support Swain. Former faction leader William J. Alexander was strongly anti-Jackson but hated David L. Swain.[41] The voters in Alexander's county had given strong evidence that they favored Jackson and Brown, but Alexander had survived the election because he had taken no stand on Brown's reelection and there was only one Jackson candidate running for a seat in the House of Commons.[42] The administration organ declared that Alexander was instructed to vote for Brown.[43] Swain received several letters warning him of Alexander's "treachery," and with-

[35] Willie P. Mangum to David L. Swain, December 22, 1833, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* II, 54.
[36] Charlotte *Miners and Farmers Journal,* July 12, 1834.
[37] Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* August 9, 1834; Bedford Brown to Martin Van Buren, September 24, 1834, McPherson, "Letters to Van Buren," 63.
[38] Romulus Saunders to Martin Van Buren, August 20, 1834, McPherson, "Letters to Van Buren," 62.
[39] Thomas Polk to David L. Swain, Salisbury, October 17, 1834, David Caldwell to David L. Swain, Salisbury, October 25, 1834, David L. Swain Correspondence, IV.
[40] John Owen to David L. Swain, Bladen County, September 8, 1832, David L. Swain Correspondence, IV.
[41] Hugh Waddell to W. A. Graham, Hillsboro, December 15, 1833, W. A. Graham Papers, Raleigh.
[42] Charlotte *Miners and Farmers Journal,* August 16, 1834,
[43] Raleigh *Standard,* November 28, 1834.

out the votes of Alexander's friends Swain's candidacy was doomed to failure.[44]

The Whigs heard rumors of division among the Democrats. The *Carolina Watchman* reported that "the party" had dropped Brown and intended to nominate Robert Strange. Editor Hamilton C. Jones commented that the report of such a maneuver proved that the Democrats were in a minority.[45] Thomas Polk reported to Swain that the Democrats realized the impossibility of Brown's reelection and were trying to prevail on another Old Republican, Chief Justice Ruffin, to become a candidate. He encouraged Swain by declaring Ruffin "is not nor ever was for Jackson, but whole *hog Van Buren*—and you know swine from that market will never sell in North Carolina."[46] The Whigs were overoptimistic; the real leaders of the Democratic party remained firm behind loyal Senator Bedford Brown.

The Democrats began to concentrate on defeating Swain. The *Standard* demanded Brown's reelection and tried to convince readers that his defeat would be a personal blow to Andrew Jackson.[47] With an allusion to Swain, a writer called on all Republicans to support Brown instead of "one who has been sitting on the fence and is just ready to take his stand with the stronger party, regardless of its principles."[48] The western independents, who had considered voting for Swain, generally approved the policy of removals. James W. Gwinn, a Macon County Democrat, tried to get Swain to make his views public. Posing as a friend, Gwinn urged Swain to write a public letter of his opinions and implied that if Swain would endorse Jackson's bank policies it would insure his election.[49] Swain believed that Gwinn was trying to trick him, and that Gwinn really wished for a condemnation of Jackson's removal policy in order to insure Brown's election. Swain realized that an endorsement of Jackson's policy would cause him to lose most of his National Republican support.[50] William Gaston warned Swain that only through "silence" could he win the election.[51]

David L. Swain was a cautious politician. At about the time he received Gwinn's letter he wrote, "It will be about as difficult to stand

[44] John Owen to David L. Swain, Bladen County, September 8, 1834, Richmond Pearson to David L. Swain, Mocksville, October 18, 1834, David L. Swain, Correspondence, IV.

[45] Salisbury *Carolina Watchman*, August 23, 1834.

[46] Thomas Polk to David L. Swain, Salisbury, October 17, 1834, David L. Swain, Correspondence, IV.

[47] Raleigh *Standard*, November 7, 14, 1834.

[48] "One of the People" in Raleigh *Standard*, November 21, 1834.

[49] James W. Gwinn to David L. Swain, Franklin, September 11, 1834, David L. Swain Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

[50] David L. Swain to William Gaston, Raleigh, September 19, 1834, William Gaston Papers.

[51] William Gaston to David L. Swain, New Bern, September 30, 1834, David L. Swain, Correspondence, IV.

still as to climb."[52] He believed that the Democrats had enough votes to insure Brown's election. He had noted that "the public voice" would compel him to oppose Brown, and he regretted that he had gotten himself into such a position.[53]

Swain now saw a way to "stand still." He wrote Gwinn that he was not a candidate for the Senate but hinted strongly that he would like to retain his governorship. He wrote that state issues were more important than anyone's opinion on the various phases of the bank war. To avoid the accusation of evasion, "as a friend" he answered Gwinn's specific questions. He declared that Jackson had the right to transfer the deposits, but he doubted the expediency of the actions. He declared that the bank's charter should not be renewed without important modifications but stated his belief that the country needed such an institution.[54] Swain intended to run for governor and was taking a middle road which would neither greatly antagonize Democrats nor cause National Republicans to regard him as a deserter.

On November 17 the legislature convened. The Democrats succeeded in electing William D. Moseley as speaker of the Senate. Remembering William J. Alexander's crucial position in the senatorial contest, the Democrats permitted him to be elected speaker of the House. The Democrats had at first nominated their leader, William Haywood, Jr., but he declined to oppose Alexander. Hence Alexander and his friends were indebted to the Democrats. The Whig press cheered the victory of "a decided Whig," but the Democrats soon showed their strength.[55] In the election for state printer Philo White received ninety-nine votes against ninety-one for his two Whig opponents. Even the *Register* conceded the vote was about equal to the strength of the rival parties.[56]

On November 20, the senatorial election began. House Democrats nominated Brown and rushed through a resolution that the balloting begin immediately. The Whigs tried to delay the election, and charged the Democrats with introducing "Van Buren tactics" in the legislature.[57] Henry Seawell nominated Swain. Friends of the governor urged Seawell to withdraw the nomination, and a scene of wild confusion ensued. Finally the nomination was withdrawn and the Whigs tried an additional trick to divide the Democrats. Richard H. Alexander, long time anti-Jackson leader and one of the three North Carolinians who had

[52] David L. Swain to William Gaston, Raleigh, September 19, 1834, William Gaston Papers.
[53] David L. Swain to William Gaston, Raleigh, October 9, 1834, William Gaston Papers.
[54] David L. Swain to James W. Gwinn [Raleigh] September 23, 1834, copy in David L. Swain Papers.
[55] Raleigh *Register,* November 18, 1834.
[56] Raleigh *Register,* November 25, 1834.
[57] Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* November 29, 1834.

attended the National Republican convention, nominated Thomas Settle.[58] He pointed out that Settle had opposed recharter of the United States Bank, was an opponent of high tariff, and a friend of Andrew Jackson. John Bragg, Democratic leader from Warren County, asked R. H. Alexander if he had received Settle's permission to make the nomination. Alexander asserted he had the right to nominate whom he pleased, and Bragg poured vitriolic abuse on the Whigs for using Settle's name as a "wooden horse" to divide the Democrats.[59] The Democrats had the votes and stood by Brown, whereas the Whigs were not united in their support of Settle. Brown won the election, 113 to 60, with 21 members not voting.

In the race for governor Democrats nominated William D. Moseley while Swain was the Whig nominee. Swain had shrewdly pointed out in his letter to Gwinn that personal views on the national bank should have no bearing on a candidate's fitness for state office, and about ten Westerners agreed.[60] On the third ballot Swain defeated Moseley by ninety-seven votes to eighty-nine.[61] Swain's inaugural address included a bitter attack on the administration. The Democrats considered Swain's attack as a justification for a straight party vote in selecting councilors of state, but they did not vote as a bloc in the elections for state treasurer and lesser positions.[62]

The Whigs had first used instructions to try to remove political opponents, but the Democrats could also play the game. Since its first issue the *Standard* had attacked Mangum. Since Whigs had tried to use instructions to remove Brown from the Senate, it hinted that Democrats should retaliate and eliminate Mangum with the same weapon.[63] The Washington *Globe,* the national organ, had called on North Carolina to instruct its senators to support Thomas Hart Benton's expunging resolution. Benton's resolution would have erased the censure of Jackson from the records of the Senate, and Whigs expected their opponents to introduce such a measure.[64] On November 28, Dr. John Potts introduced a resolution to instruct the senators to support Benton's resolution. The Whig press denounced the Democrats for the partisan purpose behind the resolution and rebuked Democrats for subserviency to the national party. The *Western Carolinian* declared Potts' resolution was "disgusting to all but those . . . blinded by manworship."[65] The Whig legislators tried to delay the resolution, and then denounced the

[58] Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* December 12, 1831.
[59] Raleigh *Register,* November 25, 1834.
[60] David L. Swain to James W. Gwinn [Raleigh], September 23, 1834, copy in David L. Swain Papers.
[61] Raleigh *Register,* January 2, 1835.
[62] James Hutchison, *To the Freemen of Mecklenberg County, 1835,* 2.
[63] Raleigh *Standard,* November 7, 14, 21, 1834.
[64] Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* December 6, 1834.
[65] Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* December 6, 1834; Hillsboro *Recorder,* December 17, 1834.

Democrats for wasting public money.[66] The Democrats answered by rebuking the Whigs for unnecessarily prolonging the debate; the Jackson men tried hard to see that the Whigs received the blame for the excessive expenditures of the session.[67]

The debate was bitter in both houses. Samuel Fleming, Burke County Whig, declared it would be a "cowardly dereliction of duty . . . to remain silent while a fiend . . . is endeavoring to apply the torch to the citadel of American liberty." He reminded the Democrats that next year the Whigs might have a majority and predicted that the Van Buren men would howl in anguish if a Whig majority tried to instruct Brown out of the Senate. Forgetting that the Whigs had begun the policy of instructing political enemies, he called the resolution part of the "Jacksonian . . . reign of terror" to put down all who differed with them.[68] Some Whigs asserted that instructions should come from the people meeting in primary assemblies rather than from a legislature that had been selected for other purposes. Hugh McQueen of Chatham County tried to limit instructions to matters of expediency, and to allow the senators to decide questions of constitutional interpretation for themselves. William A. Graham argued that Jackson's usurpations threatened the independence of the Senate and that it was unconstitutional to mutilate the Senate Journal. Samuel Carson delivered a long tirade against the administration; and John Branch held the floor for two days delivering a narrative of his experiences as a witness to and victim of the administration's tyranny.[69]

The Democrats had the votes. James Graham, a Whig observer, noted that Branch, Carson, and others had by their "violent assaults done more to sustain General Jackson than all his friends." Graham knew that the people always sympathize with a person they believe unjustly persecuted, and he feared that the Democrats would gain as a result of the attack.[70] Weldon Edwards and a few other Democrats made strong speeches defending the right of instructions, but most Democrats sat back and let their opponents do the talking.[71] On December 11, the House passed the resolution upholding the right of instruction by ninety-nine votes to twenty-eight, but it passed the instruction to expunge by a vote of only sixty-nine to fifty-seven. On December 27, the Senate approved the right of instruction forty-one to nineteen and the specific instructions thirty-three to twenty-eight.[72]

[66] David Caldwell's Speech, Raleigh *Register,* December 30, 1834.
[67] "Q in the Corner," in Raleigh *Standard,* January 12, 1835.
[68] Samuel Fleming's Speech, Raleigh *Register,* December 23, 1834.
[69] Raleigh *Register,* December 30, 1834, January 27, 1835; John Branch's speech, Charlotte *Miners and Farmers Journal,* March 5, 1835.
[70] James Graham to W. A. Graham, Washington, December 20, 1834, W. A. Graham Papers, University of North Carolina.
[71] Weldon Edwards' Speech, Tarboro *Free Press,* February 28, 1835.
[72] Raleigh *Register,* January 27, 1835.

Brown needed no instructions to support the resolution to expunge, and unless his own friends felt it desirable Mangum would neither obey nor resign. Mangum realized that other Whig senators were in a similar predicament, and he believed his resignation would cause them to follow his action. This would give the Democrats control of the Senate. Mangum called the Senate "the only barrier to . . . *absolute power* . . . of the executive," and he refused to resign.[73] He declared that the legislature had no right to require him to become an instrument of its own degradation. His duty, said he, was to guard the honor of the state and this required him to disregard the instructions. He voted to table Benton's resolution.[74]

Although Mangum lost some popularity with non-partisans for refusing to resign, he emerged as the leader of a co-ordinated and disciplined political party. In North Carolina neither the removals nor the instruction debate caused much change in political sentiment, but in the battles that followed, the two party system emerged.

With the possible exception of the nullification fight, the bank fight is the most dramatic political battle of the Jackson era. The issue was political and emotional, not economic. At the beginning of the controversy to neither Andrew Jackson nor the politicians who sustained him was there any vital economic objection to the bank. In his first message "Old Hickory" expressed doubts concerning the constitutionality of the bank. To Jackson and to the Van Buren wing of the Democratic party the principles of limited federal government made a national bank wrong. When Jackson retaliated against Nicholas Biddle, the Old Republicans were happy to fight for him and for the original principles of the party. That the nullifiers joined the nationalists to champion the United States Bank simply showed that the followers of Calhoun and Branch were self-seeking opportunists willing to take any position that might enable them to regain political power.

[73] Willie P. Mangum to W. A. Graham, Washington, December 16, 17, 1834, *Willie P. Mangum Papers*, II, 240-247.

[74] Willie P. Mangum's Speech, Hillsboro *Recorder*, March 20, 1835.

CHAPTER IX

PARTISANISM BRINGS VICTORY TO THE WEST

"The question of amendments to the constitution will be brought before the legislature. . . . Both parties are willing to make sacrifices."

Raleigh *Standard*[1]

"The spirit of improvements was abroad on the face of the earth, and he hoped that its general influence would extend to the land of his constituents. Gentlemen of the West had assured him that, at the next session under the new constitution, they would almost move heaven and earth to effect a communication with Beaufort."

Raleigh *Register* paraphrasing James Bryan's speech in the state Senate[2]

The revival of a two-party partisanism was to bring a blessing to Western North Carolinians. Their demand for constitutional revision was very great. Throughout the 1820's western papers frequently printed editorials or anonymous letters demanding that the West be given equal rights.[3] Politicians talked much about the need for a convention that would grant the West its just portion of political power. Westerners agitated for the creation of new western counties and demanded either a direct referendum on certain specific constitutional amendments or a constitutional convention.

In 1831 sectionalism reached its height. The capitol building burned, and in western towns leading politicians announced their support for moving the capital to Fayetteville providing the politicians from the Cape Fear region would support a constitutional convention. The alliance was made, but despite the tremendous enthusiasm of that year the Westerners failed in their objective. In 1832 and 1833 the Westerners continued to agitate, but under the old state constitution the Eastern counties had a majority and would not allow constitutional change.[4] As long as politics remained personal the Western hopes for equality were doomed to failure.

The emergence of a two-party system made the East less unwilling to make concessions. In 1833 prominent Raleigh Democrats Romulus

[1] November 7, 1834. [2] January 19, 1836.
[3] "William Tell" in Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* April 10, 1827.
[4] Raleigh *Star,* June 30, August 11, 1831; Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* July 25, December 19, 1831, July 19, 1832.

M. Saunders and William Haywood, Jr. headed a committee to support the aspirations of the West. They hoped that their efforts would result in increasing Democratic strength in the western part of the state.[5] Most Eastern Democrats were not partisan enough to follow Haywood and Saunders, and the 1833-1834 legislature adjourned without granting constitutional revision.

Weston Gales and other prominent Eastern Whigs joined Haywood and Saunders in agitating for Western rights.[6] Thus they kept the Democrats from making much political gain in the West. Eastern Whigs began to see increased party strength from increasing the power of the West and took a conciliatory stand. John McLeod, Johnson County Whig leader, issued a circular declaring that a referendum on specific amendments would give general satisfaction.[7] The Edenton *Gazette* expressed a willingness to support the referendum, and the Oxford *Examiner* declared that Easterners would meet "their western brethren in a just and equitable compromise."[8] The New Bern *Spectator* favored constitutional reform and dropped hints that changes in representation would weaken the Democratic party.[9]

Certain eastern groups were willing to increase the power of the West in order to secure an improved transportation system. This was especially true in Carteret County, where citizens hoped to make Beaufort the leading port of the state. The New Bern *Spectator* told voters that in order to secure internal improvements they must first support legislators who were willing to conciliate the West.[10] An eastern writer declared that the West was pledged "to give us internal improvements" if we give them constitutional revision, and he demanded that his section make the exchange.[11] The *Western Carolinian* thanked Easterners for support and said that they were "dispelling the fatal error . . . that the East and West have antagonistic interests." It nevertheless repeated the warning, "Nothing of importance would be effected toward improving communication until a reformed constitution is adopted."[12]

As they had in previous years, western politicians threatened to take extra-legal action if the eastern majority in the legislature refused to grant them constitutional revision. Grand juries of Lincoln, Burke, Wilkes, and Rowan counties declared that if their demands went un-

[5] William Haywood, Jr., to Martin Van Buren, January 10, 1833, McPherson, "Letters to Van Buren," 58.
[6] Raleigh *Register,* January 25, 1834.
[7] "Circular of John McLeod," Raleigh *Register,* January 28, 1834.
[8] Raleigh *Register,* February 25, 1834, quoting the Edenton *Gazette,* and April 15, 1834, quoting the Oxford *Examiner.*
[9] New Bern *Spectator,* August 8, 1834.
[10] Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* August 2, 1834, quoting the New Bern *Spectator.*
[11] "Halifax" in Raleigh *Register,* September 2, 1834.
[12] Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* April 12, 19, 1834.

answered the people would be justified in taking revolutionary action.[13] The *Carolina Watchman* warned that if the legislature did not submit an amended constitution to the people, the West would act alone. Editor Jones asserted: "Rash and violent measures should be avoided . . . but let us say to the East, *our political rights you must allow us.* WE WILL HAVE THEM."[14]

By 1834 some liberal Easterners were willing to grant concessions to the West. They realized that the old constitution was unfair to the West and a few feared that if some of the western demands were not granted revolution might occur. Some of the Easterners realized that constitutional revision was inevitable, and they believed that it was to their own advantage to grant certain concessions while the Westerners were willing to compromise. In 1831 when sectional hostility reached its zenith, political parties had not yet formed, and virtually no Eastern leader would risk his political fortunes at home in order to gain popularity in the West. But in 1834 partisan feeling was very great, and party leaders from the East were unwilling to oppose revision for fear of weakening their party in the West. Among Easterners, citizens from Carteret, Craven, and Cumberland counties were the most conciliatory toward the West, and they were willing to increase western voting strength in the hope that the Westerners would support certain specific internal improvements which they demanded.

The legislature of 1834 was a very partisan body. Eastern Democratic leaders Richard Dobbs Spaight, William Haywood, Jr., and William Moseley were sponsors of a direct referendum bill. This would have allowed the people to vote on specific amendments to the constitution. Whigs feared that if it passed the Democratic championship of the measure would increase Democratic strength in the West.[15] In his annual address Governor David L. Swain, long-time champion of constitutional revision but a partisan Whig, put partisanism above state sectionalism. He declared that the direct referendum was illegal, but he made an ardent plea for the passage of a bill which would call a convention to amend the constitution.[16] The attitude of Spaight, Haywood, and Moseley toward a convention was unknown, and the Raleigh *Register* accused them of blocking constitutional reform for partisan reasons.[17] Swain's plea for a convention placed the Democratic leaders in a dilemma. They either had to support the convention, a measure

[13] Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* August 23, October 11, 1834; Hillsboro *Recorder,* August 6, September 3, 1834, quoting the Salisbury *Carolina Watchman.*
[14] Salisbury *Carolina Watchman,* August 23, 1834.
[15] Richard H. Alexander to Willie P. Mangum, January 6, 1835, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* II, 276.
[16] David L. Swain's Annual Message, Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* December 6, 1834.
[17] Raleigh *Register,* December 30, 1834.

championed by their political enemies, or be branded as opponents of revision.

On November 29, 1834, western Whig leader John Beard introduced a convention bill. It provided that the people vote in a special election for or against a convention. If a majority voted for a convention the white voters in another special election would select convention delegates. Each electoral district would be entitled to ten representatives apportioned among the counties on the basis of federal population. The convention was to be limited in power. It was required to change the basis of representation to taxation and population. It could provide for biennial sessions of the legislature, allow direct election of the governor, abolish borough representation, disfranchise free Negroes, change the religious qualification for holding office and provide for future amendments to the constitution. In a third special election the white voters would ratify or reject the work of the convention. Beard's proposal served as the framework for the final convention bill.[18]

Many important changes were made before the bill reached its final passage. Easterners secured an amendment requiring that the delegates be selected by counties instead of by electoral districts, and eastern dominance at the convention was insured. They added amendments requiring that federal population be the basis of representation in the House of Commons and that in the Senate representation be based on taxation. Free Negroes were allowed to vote in all three special elections. Even with these amendments few Easterners were willing to support the bill.[19]

Observers noted that the vote would be close. In the House eleven Easterners voted with the West and the bill passed by four votes. Eastern Democrats supporting the bill were William Haywood, Jr., of Wake County, Dillon Jordon and David McNeil of Cumberland County, and Abner Hartley and Frederick P. Lathan of Craven County. Eastern Whigs supporting the bill were Edward B. Dudley of Wilmington, Thomas Ousby of Halifax, James Seawell of Fayetteville, Mathias Manly of New Bern, and James Manney and Elijah Bell of Carteret County. In the Senate the decision was even closer and the bill passed by a vote of thirty-one to thirty. John Branch demanded and secured additional concessions to the East, and on the final passage of the bill he and one other Eastern Whig did not vote. They could have defeated the convention. The House concurred in the Senate's amendments, and the bill became law[20] Although an Easterner, Speaker William Moseley, an ardent Democrat, did not exercise his prerogative to vote on the bill. Had Moseley not been unwilling to see his party denounced for blocking the convention, he probably would have cast

[18] Raleigh *Register,* December 13, 1834.
[19] Raleigh *Register,* January 3, 10, 17, 1835.
[20] Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* January 10, 17, 1835.

his vote against the bill and thus kept the convention from becoming law. Democrats Richard Dobbs Spaight of Craven County, Ottway Burns of Carteret, Duncan McCormick of Cumberland, and William B. Lockhart of Northampton were the only Easterners who supported the bill.[21] Even though the convention plan was a Whig measure, the vote of Eastern Democrats caused its passage.

Westerners were disappointed in the amendments, but most of them declared that the law was the best they could have secured and worked hard to get a large turnout for the first special election.[22] By almost a straight sectional vote the people voted for a convention. Of the 27,550 voters who favored a convention, 24,849 were from the West while of the 21,694 who voted against a convention 18,083 lived in the East.[23] The approaching election for delegates caused little excitement, and convention candidates made little effort to combine. Some politicians felt that their votes in the convention might be used against them and refused to stand as candidates.[24]

As the time for the convention approached, some Whig editors attempted a shrewd political maneuver which, if successful, would give their party a presidential candidate from the state. The *Star* and the New Bern *Spectator* called on the convention to nominate Federalist William Gaston for President of the United States. The *Register* approved, and the *Western Carolinian* declared Gaston was preferable to "any parasite of Jackson."[25] But the idea of a presidential nomination by the convention did not "take" with the people, and most Whigs were already leaning toward Hugh Lawson White as their presidential candidate. No nomination was attempted.

The convention had a majority of Whigs but was primarily nonpartisan. The delegates elected Joseph and Weston Gales, editors of the Whig organ, the *Register,* printers by an overwhelming majority. Democratic elder statesman Nathaniel Macon was unanimously elected chairman. Most of the work was done in committees composed of one member from each electoral district.[26]

The most important question concerned representation. David L. Swain was chairman of a committee to draft the amendment and determine the number for each house. He reported an amendment providing for a House of 120 members and a Senate of 50 selected as pro-

[21] *Journal of the Senate and House of Commons of the General Assembly of North Carolina at the Session of 1834-1835* (Raleigh, 1835), 104, 228.

[22] Hillsboro *Recorder,* January 9, 1835: Hutchison, *To the Freemen of Mecklenberg,* 1.

[23] Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* January 10, 1835.

[24] Hugh Waddell to W. A. Graham, Salisbury, April 9, 1835, W. A. Graham Papers, Raleigh.

[25] Raleigh *Register,* February 22, 1835, quoting the New Bern *Spectator;* Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* February 21, 1835; Raleigh *Standard,* February 13, 1835, quoting the Raleigh *Star.*

[26] Raleigh *Standard,* June 12, 1835.

vided in the convention act. A few members wished to ignore the legislature's instructions, and Jesse Speight made an ardent but unsuccessful plea for a House of one hundred members based on free white population and a Senate of one member from each county. His proposal would have given the West a majority in the House and the East a majority in the Senate.[27] Speight was a Democrat, and the New Bern *Spectator* attacked him as a demagogue willing to sacrifice the interest of his section.[28] Generally Easterners wished to lower the number of members in the House to ninety or one hundred in order to lessen the West's majority, but James Bryan of Carteret County openly pleaded for a deal. He declared his willingness to support the western plan for a 120-member House providing Westerners would support certain internal improvements demanded by the citizens of Beaufort. Western delegates agreed, and despite pleas by John Branch and others for lowering the number of representatives, enough eastern members voted with the West, and a 120-member House won approval.[29] In arranging Senate districts the Whigs made some effort to give themselves an advantage.[30] The Westerners won the most important battle in the convention, and their victory increased the strength of the Whig party in the legislature.

The Whigs surrendered a slight advantage by eliminating borough representation. Dr. James S. Smith, an Orange County Whig, led the fight to eliminate borough representation, but state Whig leaders William B. Meares, William Gaston, and John Branch were the leading defenders. A compromise to allow the chief ports to retain borough representatives was seriously considered, but the inland boroughs of Salisbury, Hillsboro, and Halifax were Whig strongholds, and the voters from the main ports, Wilmington, Fayetteville, and New Bern were about evenly divided between the parties. Most of the eastern borough representatives had voted for a convention, and other Easterners, disinclined to allow them special privileges, voted against retaining any borough franchise.[31]

The Whigs lost a few votes when they disfranchised free Negroes. The advocates of a convention had hinted broadly that they intended to deprive the free Negroes of the ballot, and the general prejudice seemed to demand it. Whig William B. Meares argued rather illogically that the framers of the original constitution had not intended to allow any Negro the right to vote, and John Cooper of New Hanover County argued that with "a little to drink" Negroes could be "bought like a lot of poultry." Hugh McQueen of Chatham County and Jesse Wilson

[27] Raleigh *Standard,* June 19, 1835.
[28] Raleigh *Register,* September 29, 1835, quoting the New Bern *Spectator.*
[29] Raleigh *Register,* January 19, 1836; Raleigh *Standard,* June 26, 1835.
[30] Tarboro *Free Press,* September 3, 1836, quoting the Raleigh *Standard.*
[31] William Gaston to Eliza Gaston, Raleigh, June 22, 1835, William Gaston Papers; Raleigh *Standard,* July 3, 1835.

of Perquimans asserted that if free Negroes retained the right to vote it would "encourage amalgamation."[32] Nathaniel Macon and Jesse Speight added their voices to the outcry against voting by black men. William Gaston declared that if free Negroes were Christian and honest they should have the right to vote, and Emmanuel Shober proposed a more practical qualification. He would limit free Negro voting to those who owned property valued at $100; Joseph John Daniel of Halifax proposed to raise the property qualification to $250. Charles Fisher, John Giles, and David L. Swain supported the compromise, and the observant editor of the *Standard* pointed out that all three had been present at a Whig meeting in Salisbury which unanimously condemned Van Buren for supporting a similar compromise in New York. In spite of their support the convention disfranchised all Negroes.[33]

One other amendment concerned prejudice and bigotry. The convention had the right to abolish or amend the provision of the old constitution prohibiting officeholding to those who "denied" the truth of the Protestant religion, and the delegates devoted more time to this issue than to any other matter. Many Westerners made personal professions of tolerance. They cited the elevation of the Catholic William Gaston to the Supreme Court as proof that no amendment was necessary. They declared that they would not jeopardize the change in representation by connecting it with an unnecessary amendment which might possibly cause the defeat of more important reforms. Easterners in general argued that the article must be stricken out, and Jesse Wilson even hinted strongly that if Easterners would vote to eliminate the provision they might be able to defeat ratification of the amended constitution. Enough Easterners voted with the West to defeat the change, and then Gaston proposed substituting the word Christian for the word Protestant. John Branch declared that he favored allowing Catholics to hold office but would not accept an amendment which discriminated against Jews. On the final vote seventy-four delegates agreed to substitute the word "Christian," and fifty-three opposed.[34]

One of the most popular amendments called for the direct election of the governor. William Gaston noted that few of the proposers of direct election "really cared a fig for it, but . . . thought it would *take* with the people and gain friends for their cause." He had no doubt that the "popular claptrap" would pass, but with Nathaniel Macon, Weldon Edwards, Joseph John Daniel, and others he opposed the measure.[35] The original proposal called for the people to elect a governor for a four-

[32] Raleigh *Standard,* June 19, 1835.
[33] Raleigh *Standard,* June 26, July 10, 1835.
[34] Raleigh *Standard,* July 3, 10, 1835.
[35] William Gaston to Mathew M. Moore, Raleigh, August 16, 1835, William Gaston Papers.

year term, but it was amended to provide for a two-year term and easily passed the convention.[36]

Equally popular was the amendment that allowed biennial sessions. James S. Smith, Samuel King, and Jesse Wilson were its leading advocates. They argued that it would save the state $40,000 every year, and Wilson averred that the legislators in their annual session never did anything to justify the expenditure of forty cents. Macon and Edwards defended annual sessions. With an allusion to the Whigs who discussed so much irrelevant matter during the debate to instruct Mangum, Macon insisted that the large expenditures were not due to annual sessions, but to legislators who talked too long. In spite of Macon the members of the convention voted by a large majority to end annual sessions.[37]

The voters had to accept all the amendments or vote for rejection, and Easterners found many reasons to oppose them. The Reverend Joshua Lawrence, aggressive but unlearned Old School Baptist leader,[38] published a series of letters in the Tarboro *Free Press* warning of the calamity that would occur should Catholics be allowed to hold office. He asserted that all Catholics were subversive instruments of a tyrannical Pope and charged that Catholics had been persecutors for twelve hundred years. He declared that he would never vote for any man who supported the amendment, and called on all Baptists to do likewise. Lawrence asserted that Catholics considered themselves the only true Christians and regarded Protestants as heretics, and he argued that if the Catholics gained control of the courts they would declare that Protestants denied the truth of the Christian religion and hence exclude them from office. George Howard, editor of the *Free Press,* reprinted Lawrence's articles in a pamphlet entitled *The Mouse Trying to Gnaw Out of the Catholic Trap* and offered it for sale. An anonymous writer took up the charge and denounced the convention for admitting "jesuitical venders of indulgences" and keeping out "virtuous and incorruptible Mordecais."[39] Most readers of the articles intended to vote against the amendments anyway, and such tactics had little effect on the voting. There was little anti-Catholic outcry in the West.

Easterners raised objections to other amendments. The New Bern *Spectator* objected to abolishing borough representation, to popular election of the governor, to disfranchisement of free Negroes, and to the inclusion of religious restrictions. The Edenton *Gazette* objected to the 120-member House and called on the East to oppose unanimously the amendments. The Wilmington *Free Press* objected to the failure

[36] Raleigh *Standard,* July 10, 1835.
[37] Raleigh *Standard,* June 26, 1835.
[38] Henry S. Stroupe, "The Beginnings of Religious Journalism in North Carolina, 1823-1865," *North Carolina Historical Review,* XXX (January, 1953), 8.
[39] Tarboro *Free Press,* May 30, June 13, August 1, September 5, 1835.

to eliminate all religious restrictions. The *Register* published a report that Cumberland County Democrats planned to oppose ratification since the convention was "Whig to the core," but the Fayetteville *Observer,* a Whig paper, declared the report was "true only to a very small extent."[40] The fight over ratification was not a party battle.

The amendments were ratified by almost the same sectional vote that had approved the convention. In the final election 26,771 people voted for ratification while 21,066 opposed. About nine-tenths of the voters who favored the amendments came from the West, and at least seven-eighths of the people who opposed them lived in the East.[41] For the whole state the final solution to the long standing question came as a relief.

Whigs gained more political advantage from constitutional revision than their rivals. They had sponsored the convention plan, and since their method of revision had been adopted they expected Westerners to support their party. They had blocked the Democratic plan for direct referendum, and the Democrats lacked the stubborn partisan spirit to block the Whig convention plan. The West already contained a larger percentage of Whigs than the East, and the revised constitution would increase western representation.

Although partisan considerations were important, an equally decisive factor in bringing about constitutional revision was the demand for internal improvements. Enough Easterners had been willing to surrender sectional political dominance in exchange for specific improvements to bring victory to the West. To advocates of internal improvements, constitutional reform meant that the votes were at hand for statewide projects. The next major question was how to obtain the money. The Whigs had a clever answer in distribution of the proceeds from federal lands sales. As the issue of constitutional revision subsided, the Democrats were forced to fight a desperate defensive battle against a policy not of their own choosing.

[40] Raleigh *Register,* September 29, 1835, quoting the New Bern *Spectator,* August 4, 1835, quoting the Edenton *Gazette* and Wilmington *Free Press,* September 22, 1835; Fayetteville *Observer,* September 29, 1835.

[41] Tarboro *Free Press,* December 19, 1835.

CHAPTER X

DEMOCRATS ON THE DEFENSIVE: THE GREAT DEBATE OVER LAND POLICY

> "The old states should . . . not tolerate for a moment the idea of giving up the lands to the new states, or reducing the price . . . but . . . ought to require that the public domain be held as a *common fund for the use and benefit of all the states* . . . . North Carolina's share would be nearly $300,000 a year. . . . Railroads and canals could be constructed through the state and then a system of schools. . . . Shall we take it and apply it to our own use and benefit, instead of permitting others to riot upon it at our expense?"
>
> Lewis Williams[1]

> "The land bill and the distribution of the surplus have been operating for some time prejudicial to our cause."
>
> Bedford Brown[2]

While the people were going through the slow process of amending the constitution, the Whigs discovered an issue which they thought would win them control of the state. Their plan, distributing the proceeds of the sale of western lands, was not new. The legislatures of 1828 and 1829 had debated resolutions on land policy, but these had caused little comment in the press or among politicians.[3] The North Carolina press gave only casual attention to land resolutions in Congress, or to memorials of state legislatures that advocated distribution.[4] Jackson's veto of Clay's first distribution bill in 1833 received some condemnation in the National Republican press and in handbills by anti-Jackson congressmen.[5] As a general rule the anti-Jackson men favored distribution and the Jacksonians opposed it, but before 1834 neither group placed emphasis on the question.

National land policy was a complex issue. Westerners wanted either reduction of land prices or the cession of the public lands to the

[1] Lewis Williams, *To the Citizens of the Thirteenth Congressional District of North Carolina* (Washington, February 18, 1835), 4. Hereinafter cited *To the Citizens*, 1835.

[2] Bedford Brown to Martin Van Buren, October 11, 1836, McPherson, "Letters to Van Buren," 69.

[3] New Bern *Spectator*, January 2, December 31, 1829.

[4] New Bern *Spectator*, January 24, 1829; Halifax *Minerva*, January 28, 1830; Tarboro *Free Press*, February 5, 1830, March 29, 1831.

[5] New Bern *Spectator*, March 15, 1833; Lewis Williams, *To the Citizens*, 1833, 15.

states in which they were situated. Both Northeasterners and Southeasterners wanted a share of the proceeds, but some Southeasterners would have preferred for the federal government to use the proceeds for its own operating expenses and reduce the tariff below general revenue needs. The sectional division was complicated by partisan considerations. Democrats led by Thomas Hart Benton advocated lowering land prices; and Whigs, led by Henry Clay and Daniel Webster, generally favored distribution. Some partisans were willing to follow party instead of section.

Lewis Williams was an early advocate of distribution. In January, 1833, he charged that the Democrats intended to give the public lands to the western states in order "to purchase the votes of those states for Van Buren as the next president."[6] Two years later this was to be the Whig battle cry. Although Democratic leaders never considered ceding the lands to the western states, Williams and most other Whig leaders constantly reiterated the charge.

David L. Swain did more than anyone else to make the North Carolina Whigs the champions of distribution. After his reelection as governor in 1834 he dropped all pretense of non-partisanism and became the most ardent champion of the Whig policy. Remembering Mangum's desire to be instructed,[7] Swain, in his last inaugural address, gave a detailed historical account of land cessions to the Confederation and declared that the original states ceded their western lands to the union in order to pay the country's Revolutionary War debt. Since the debt was virtually paid, Swain argued that the old states were justly entitled to the proceeds from the remaining land. He was willing to grant the western states a portion of the proceeds and considered federal population a fair basis for distribution. The Governor painted a beautiful picture of North Carolina with $300,000 annually from the federal government to finance railroad and canal projects and the profits from these projects supporting free public schools. He charged that in order to maintain itself in power the Democratic administration was refusing to grant the old states their fair portion of the common treasure.[8]

After the House of Commons finished its debate on the instructions resolution, Pleasant Henderson, Surry County Whig, introduced two resolutions on federal land policy. The first stated that any law by the federal government either to cede the lands to western states or to lower the price of public lands was an injustice to the old states. The second resolution requested permanent distribution of the proceeds of public lands to all states. In defending the resolution George Outlaw asserted

[6] Lewis Williams to William Lenoir, Washington, January 11, 1833, Lenoir Family Papers.

[7] Willie P. Mangum to David L. Swain, December 22, 1833, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* II, 54.

[8] David L. Swain's Inaugural Address, Hillsboro *Recorder,* November 28, 1834.

that the Democrats opposed distribution because they intended to cede the lands to the western states. Samuel King charged that the administration favored reducing land prices in order to make Thomas Hart Benton vice-president. John Bragg, Democrat from Warren County, spoke against the resolution and attacked Swain for bringing up the question of public lands in his inaugural after ignoring it in his annual message. He charged that Swain wanted to "manufacture paupers" and declared Congress had no constitutional right to distribute the proceeds.[9] About half the Democrats voted for the resolution and it passed the House eighty-two to thirty-two.

William Haywood and other Democrats filed a protest. They admitted that ceding land to the western states was unfair to the old states but would not concede that lowering land prices constituted any act of injustice. The Haywood group objected to asking Congress to regulate land sales for the benefit of the old states and declared that Congress should legislate for the benefit of the whole union. They also pointed out that permanent distribution would weaken the nation in time of war. The Democrats who signed the protest asked if the resolution was meant as instructions and asserted that if so the Whigs had been untruthful in denying the right of the legislature to instruct Mangum. They declared that if the resolution was not meant as instructions, the Whigs were guilty of wasting public money by discussing it. A majority of the Senate refused to consider Henderson's resolution, and the people considered Haywood's protest as the Democratic stand.[10]

The legislative discussions created an issue, and the Whigs rebuked the Democrats for their opposition. The *Western Carolinian* attacked Haywood's protest as typical of the "cant" of the Democrats, who had "sacrificed the dignity of poor old North Carolina to gratify a miserable cabal at Washington."[11] William J. Alexander asserted that the refusal of the Democrats in the Senate to consider the resolution would cause distribution to fail, and North Carolina would lose several hundred thousand dollars annually.[12] Lewis Williams wrote his constituents that if distribution passed North Carolina could begin a $5,000,000 road building project "without one cent tax of any kind."[13] Abraham Rencher also issued a circular in which he argued that the old states had the right to the revenue from public lands. He called on the citizens to "say whether they will suffer those most important rights to be sacrificed for the sake of party."[14]

[9] Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* January 10, 24, 1835; Bragg's Speech, Raleigh *Standard,* February 6, 1835.
[10] Raleigh *Standard,* January 16, 1835.
[11] Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* January 24, 1835.
[12] Extracts from Alexander's Circular, Raleigh *Register,* March 10, 1835.
[13] Lewis Williams, *To the Citizens,* 1835, 4-5.
[14] A[braham] Rencher, *To the Citizens of the Tenth Congressional District* (Washington, March 6, 1835), 1.

The Whigs attacked the Democratic proposal for reducing land prices. James Graham charged that the Democratic plan amounted to "a tax to rob the poor of North Carolina to enrich the poor of other states."[15] Edmund Deberry declared that reducing the land prices would throw the public lands into the hands of speculators.[16] Pleasant Henderson issued a circular in which he reiterated that a reduction of the minimum price would constitute a great injustice to the land owners of the state.[17] Reducing land prices was not popular in North Carolina.

Democrats declared that distribution would mean increased taxation. Dr. Thomas Hall issued a circular opposing distribution. He emphasized its unconstitutionality, but he also insisted that distribution would mean higher taxes. He declared that if a surplus existed it should be returned to the "pockets of the people" by lowering the tariff.[18] The *Standard* cited figures to show that if the proposed distribution bill passed there would be a deficit of approximately $3,200,000 which could be made up only by increased taxation. The Democratic organ declared that the land bill was "the first step toward breaking the compromise tariff."[19]

The congressional elections came at the height of the distribution issue. The Whigs won one outstanding victory when they defeated Dr. Thomas Hall. The Whigs of the district, which included Edgecombe, Pitt, Beaufort, Hyde, Washington and Tyrrell counties, became highly organized, and in county meetings they named delegates to a convention to select their candidate. The convention named Ebenezer Pettigrew.[20] Whigs bitterly denounced Dr. Hall for opposing distribution.[21] Pettigrew won the election, receiving 3,124 votes to 2,516 votes for Hall.[22] The doctor's opposition to distribution probably cost him the election.

Pettigrew was the only new Whig to enter Congress from North Carolina, but six of the seven incumbents won reelection. Lewis Williams and Augustine Shepperd were reelected without opposition. Edmund Deberry campaigned on a distribution platform and also denounced the removal of the deposits.[23] He again defeated Lauchlin Bethune, receiving 3,426 votes while Bethune received 2,940. Editor Francis P.

[15] Extracts from Graham's Circular, Hillsboro *Recorder,* April 3, 1835.
[16] Edmund Deberry, *To the Freemen of Anson, Richmond, Cumberland, Moore and Montgomery* (Washington, February 28, 1835), 1. Edmund Deberry Papers. Hereinafter cited *To the Freemen.*
[17] "Circular of Pleasant Henderson to the Voters of Surry County," Hillsboro *Recorder,* August 16, 1835.
[18] Thomas Hall, *To the Qualified Voters of the Third Congressional District of North Carolina* [Washington] 1835, 2-3.
[19] Raleigh *Standard,* January 2, 1835.
[20] Raleigh *Register,* December 23, 1834.
[21] Z. W. Burrows to Ebenezer Pettigrew [Washington, North Carolina] July [1835], Pettigrew Papers, II, 84.
[22] Raleigh *Register,* September 8, 1835.
[23] Deberry, *To the Freemen,* 1, Edmund Deberry Papers.

Blair of the Washington *Globe* wrote a letter in an attempt to defeat William B. Shepard, but Shepard received 2,534 votes while his opponent, Dr. Isaac Pipkin, a political unknown, received only 429 votes.[24] In the Salisbury District two other Whigs and one Democrat hoped to replace Abraham Rencher, but the incumbent won reelection. Richard Cotton, the Democrat, withdrew. Rencher received 3,118 votes, Burton Craig received 1,622, and Richmond Pearson received 1,297. The closest contest was in the mountain district. James Graham campaigned chiefly on the distribution issue, while his main opponent, David Newland, tried to be all things to all people. The *Standard* called Newland, a Democrat and a friend of Jackson, but Newland had declared he would support Hugh Lawson White for the presidency.[25] Graham received 3,733 votes, Newland, 3,726 votes, and Brennen H. Durham, an avowed Van Buren man, received only 213 votes. Newland contested the election, and the issue was transferred to Washington.[26]

The one outstanding Democratic victory was the election of Dr. William Montgomery in the district composed of Wake, Orange, and Person counties. Daniel Barringer, who had represented the district since 1826, favored the policies of the anti-Jackson men and sought reelection. Montgomery had been the leading champion of a bill to give the white voters of each county the right to elect sheriffs. It had passed at the 1829-1830 session of the legislature after years of agitation and had brought great popularity to Montgomery, "the patron saint of the sheriff's bill."[27] Montgomery received 2,706 votes while Barringer received 2,416.[28]

Five of the six Democratic incumbents returned to Congress. Henry W. Connor defeated Bartlett Shipp 3,426 votes to 1,979, and James McKay defeated Louis Dishongh by 2,690 to 1,553. The Whigs thought they had a chance to defeat Micajah Hawkins when they induced popular Baptist minister Josiah Crudup to oppose him, but Hawkins triumphed by a vote of 2,540 to 1,522. Jesse Bynum had strong competition in William L. Long but still won reelection, receiving 2,228 votes while 1,986 people voted for Long. Jesse Speight defeated John B. McLeod, receiving 3,017 votes, 767 more than his rival.

Neither party had increased its number in the congressional delegation, but both nevertheless claimed victory. The *Register* cited figures to show that even without counting the districts represented by Augus-

[24] Francis P. Blair to Dr. J. Fowlkes, April 28, 1835, Raleigh *Register,* September 8, 1835.
[25] Raleigh *Register,* September 8, 1835; Hillsboro *Recorder,* April 13, 1835; Raleigh *Standard,* June 12, 1835.
[26] Raleigh *Register,* September 8, 1835.
[27] New Bern *Spectator,* January 17, 1829; *Acts of the General Assembly of the State of North Carolina at the Session of 1829-1830* (Raleigh, Lawrence and Lemay, 1830), 8-10.
[28] Raleigh *Register,* August 18, 1835.

tine H. Shepperd and Lewis Williams, where "Van Burenites were afraid to show their weakness," the Whigs had received 34,290 votes to 22,680 for the Democrats. They therefore claimed the voters had given instructions to support the distribution bill.[29]

The elections to the legislature were also hotly contested. A good bit of party indication was shown in the results, but Whigs still won elections in Democratic counties while Democrats often succeeded in counties that were predominantly Whig. Frequently "friends of Judge White" held meetings and selected candidates pledged to favor distribution. Democrats held similar meetings and selected candidates who promised to support the administration.[30] The Democrats won a majority of approximately fifteen seats.

The 1835 legislature, the last to meet under the old constitution, was a highly partisan body. Democrat William B. Moseley was elected speaker of the Senate, and William Haywood defeated Whig candidate William A. Graham for the position of speaker of the House. The first test of strength in a joint session came with the election of state printer, and Philo White, the Democratic candidate, won the post by 105 votes to 90. The Democrats held a caucus and selected Richard Dobbs Spaight as their candidate for governor. Many Democrats had preferred Moseley, and the *Standard* praised Moseley for "magnanimously standing aside."[31] William B. Meares was the Whig candidate. Spaight defeated Meares by 103 votes to 86 on the first ballot. Romulus Saunders was elected a judge of the Superior Court, defeating William A. Graham and William J. Alexander. The Whig press denounced the Democrats for giving a partisan vote in selecting the judiciary, but the Democrats argued that their candidate's qualifications were higher than those of his opponents.[32]

The legislature devoted more time to discussing land policy than to any other issue. Before Spaight assumed office Swain gave his last annual address and again made a strong plea for distribution. Stating that the revenue of the federal government greatly exceeded its needs, he warned that retention of surplus funds by the central government caused gross abuse of patronage and threatened republican institutions. He argued that the income of the state government barely met its needs; he stated that it would be impossible to inaugurate a system of internal improvements unless the proceeds of the public domain were distributed.[33] The Democratic press took issue with Swain and prayed that

[29] Raleigh *Register,* September 8, 1835.
[30] Raleigh *Standard,* April 19, 1835; Hillsboro *Recorder,* April 6, 1835.
[31] Raleigh *Register,* November 17, 24, 1835; Raleigh *Standard,* November 26, 1835.
[32] Raleigh *Register,* December 22, 1835, January 5, 1836; Raleigh *Standard,* January 14, 1836.
[33] David L. Swain's Annual Message, Raleigh *Register,* November 24, 1835.

the state would never "become pensioners of the general Government."[34] Instead of distributing the surplus it suggested reducing the tariff.

The new governor answered his predecessor. In his inaugural address Spaight asserted that the constitution did not grant Congress the power to distribute funds to the states and called distribution "usurpation of power." He also attacked distribution on economic grounds. He declared:

> A correct economy draws only so much from the earnings of the people as will properly administer their Government, leaving the remainder to be used by them according to the dictates of their own judgment; thus tending to increase the wealth of the state, by adding to the wealth of the citizens.[35]

Governor Spaight's solution to the problem of surplus funds was to reduce the tariff.

On November 19 in the House of Commons Thomas L. Clingman, a western Whig leader, introduced a resolution concerning land policy that was virtually the same as the one introduced in the previous legislature.[36] Clingman emphasized that the old states specifically ceded western lands to the federal government for the benefit of all the states, and he pointed out that one-fourth of the proceeds had already been given to new states in specific grants. His three basic points were that the old states were entitled to the funds, that distribution would diminish executive patronage, and that the funds would enable North Carolina to begin its much needed program of internal improvements.[37] James W. Gwinn, Democrat from Macon County, tried to amend the resolution to declare reduction of land prices "impolitic" instead of "unjust," and to allow the reduction of prices of "unsalable" land. On December 2, Gwinn withdrew his resolution, and he and his Democratic colleagues tried to substitute the Senate's proposed land bill for the original Whig motion.[38]

The Senate Democrats endorsed a plan of temporary distribution. On November 28, Harvey Waugh, Democrat from Surry County, introduced a resolution that had the support of most of his party. His resolution called the cession of public lands to the new states "a plain breach of public faith," but it said nothing concerning reduction of land prices.[39] The resolution declared that normally Congress should limit revenue to the needs of government, but since the compromise tariff had been made in good faith it should not be changed. Therefore if a surplus occurred

[34] Tarboro *Free Press,* November 28, 1835.
[35] Richard Dobbs Spaight's Inaugural Address, Raleigh *Standard,* December 17, 1835.
[36] Raleigh *Register,* November 24, 1835.
[37] Thomas L. Clingman's Speech, Raleigh *Standard,* December 17, 1835.
[38] Raleigh *Register,* December 15, 1835.
[39] Raleigh *Register,* December 8, 1835.

Congress could divide it among the states. The resolution denounced the attempt to make the land question a party issue. Waugh's resolution passed the Senate by a vote of thirty-six to twenty-seven.

The Whig editors denied that the Democrats actually favored distribution. They pointed out the inconsistency of Democrats supporting a resolution that admitted Congress could divide an "unavoidable surplus" at the same time they were declaring Congress had no constitutional right to distribute. They claimed that if the Democrats had their way and prohibited permanent distribution North Carolina would be deprived of "$500,000" a year, and there would be no roads, no canals, and no schools.[40] They asserted that Democrats evaded the issue because they believed distribution would weaken Van Buren's chances of winning the presidency.

The Democrats in the House of Commons were not partisan enough to vote as a unit. Henry Jordon, Cumberland County Democrat, led the supporters of the Senate resolution. He declared that permanent distribution would corrupt the states, lead to permanent high tariff, and weaken the country in time of war. Ralph Gorrell, Guilford County Whig, answered Jordon's arguments. He averred that Democrats in control of the central government were using surplus funds to corrupt the press. He denied that permanent distribution would lead to high tariff. He argued that a low tariff would result in a great increase in importations, and hence the total revenue collected would be as great as it had been when the tariff rate was higher. He stated that in time of war the distribution bill could be repealed, but he argued that the possibility of war eventually occurring was no reason for depriving the states of revenue to which they were justly entitled. He declared Jackson's veto of the first distribution bill had already cost the state several million dollars, and charged that the Democrats, by supporting the Senate amendment, were evading the issue. Enough House Democrats voted with the Whigs to defeat the attempt to substitute, and Clingman's original resolution passed.[41]

Neither house would yield. On December 21 the House of Commons officially received the Senate resolution, but by a vote of fifty-one to forty-seven it voted to substitute its own proposal. The Senate in turn refused to accept the House resolution and for the second time sent Waugh's measure to the House. By fifty-four to forty-three the House indefinitely postponed the Senate resolution, thus ending the debate in the legislature.[42]

The death of the resolution set off another battle of words in the press. The Fayetteville *Observer* charged that the "Van Buren party

[40] Raleigh *Register,* December 22, 1835.
[41] Henry Jordon's and Ralph Gorrell's Speeches, Raleigh *Register,* January 19, 1836.
[42] Raleigh *Register,* December 29, 1835.

in the legislature" had kept North Carolina from receiving the means of placing the people "above want"; similar phrases were repeated by all the Whig papers.[43] Some Democrats blamed the Whigs for the failure of the state to endorse a distribution resolution. Harvey Waugh issued a circular charging the Whigs with causing the defeat of his resolution, and pointing out that it condemned the cession of public lands to the western states.[44] The *Standard* and the *Register* argued back and forth as to which party had killed distribution.[45] The Whigs got the better of the exchange; the people knew they actually did favor distributing the proceeds of public lands.

While Democrats were uttering warnings that permanent distribution would weaken the nation in time of war, many people believed war was imminent.[46] In 1831 France signed a treaty agreeing to pay American Spoliation claims, but the French Assembly refused to provide funds for their payment. In his annual message of December, 1834, President Jackson suggested that Americans redress their own grievances by seizing French property. The Whig Senate strongly disapproved of reprisals and even blocked military appropriations. The French Chamber finally appropriated the money but added a proviso that it was not to be paid until the language of the President's message was satisfactorily explained. France accepted Jackson's unapologetic message of 1835 as a satisfactory explanation. The issue was settled peacefully, but in Jackson's belligerent attitude North Carolina Whigs found another club with which to strike the Democrats.

As the controversy drew to a close Thomas Hart Benton introduced a bill to spend the government's accumulating surplus for putting the nation's defenses in a state of preparedness. Whigs declared that Benton's real intent was to defeat distribution. On the Senate floor Willie P. Mangum charged that the administration deliberately created "this parade of war with France" in order to "get possession of thirty millions of surplus which would be so convenient to them in carrying out their plan of corruption."[47] Lewis Williams stated that Jackson wanted the military appropriations merely to enrich friendly contractors and to defeat the distribution bill.[48]

During the crisis North Carolina Democrats did not give full support to Jackson, but they defended military appropriations. The *Free Press* opposed reprisals and urged that a "mild and conciliatory" course

[43] Raleigh *Register,* February 2, 1836, quoting Fayetteville *Observer.*

[44] Extracts from Harvey Waugh's Circular, Raleigh *Register,* February 16, 1836.

[45] Raleigh *Register,* January 5, 12, 19, 1836; Raleigh *Standard,* January 7, 14, 1836.

[46] Henry Clark to Ebenezer Pettigrew, Washington [North Carolina] January 30, 1836, Pettigrew Papers, VI, 67.

[47] Willie P. Mangum's Speech, Hillsboro *Recorder,* April 1, 1836.

[48] Lewis Williams to William Lenoir, Washington, February 22, 1836, Lenoir Family Papers.

be followed.[49] The *Standard* failed to mention Jackson's request for reprisals in reviewing his 1834 annual message. It nevertheless severely rebuked Mangum for his pro-French policy and praised Democrats Bedford Brown and Jesse Bynum for defending appropriations. Editor Philo White called the Whigs the "French party" and charged them with risking the overthrow of America in order to gain political advantage.[50] When the French war scare ended, the Democratic press credited Jackson with upholding national honor and explained that his "energy and decision" had resulted in securing Americans their just claims.[51] After the period of tension had ended the people saw less need for military appropriations and still desired distribution.

Shortly before the end of the French crisis Henry Clay introduced another distribution bill. It provided for distributing the surplus revenue among the states. The Raleigh *Register* declared that under this bill North Carolina's share would be $988,632. Since part of the government's surplus had been derived from land sales, the *Carolina Watchman* observed that the money was "justly due for land sold: for land put in the hands of a trustee to pay a particular debt."[52] The bill passed Congress, but Jackson gave it a "pocket veto," and the Whig press charged that his action cost North Carolina a million dollars.[53] James Graham issued a circular asking whether the politicians and "pet banks" or the states should have the use of the money. He asked if Democrats "distributed" to banks why could they not distribute to states.[54]

The Whigs made one more try. John C. Calhoun drew up a bill to deposit the surplus with the states as a non-interest paying loan. Most of the Whigs assumed that the states would never be required to pay back the loan. Some Democrats supported it accepting it at face value and thus circumventing constitutional objections. The Democratic press denounced the act and charged that "the presidential candidates who fathered the bill" wanted to distress the country's deposit banks, and "dazzle the states" with federal money.[55] The bill passed, and Jackson reluctantly allowed it to become law.

The Democrats insisted that the law was not a distribution bill, but that the states were to serve as banks and hold the money until the federal government needed it.[56] They charged that Calhoun, Clay, and Webster, the authors of the deposit bill, were the real authors of a high tariff which would be necessary in a few years when the compromise

[49] Tarboro *Free Press,* January 30, 1836.
[50] Raleigh *Standard,* December 12, 1834, March 20, 1835, February 25, 1836.
[51] Tarboro *Free Press,* June 6, 1836.
[52] Raleigh *Register,* June 19, 1836, quoting the Salisbury *Carolina Watchman.*
[53] Raleigh *Register,* January 12, 1836.
[54] James Graham, *To the Freemen of the Twelfth Congressional District* (Rutherfordton [1836]), 2.
[55] Tarboro *Free Press,* May 21, 1836.
[56] Tarboro *Free Press,* July 2, 1836.

tariff no longer supplied the needs of government.[57] For their final argument they cited a toast by Jackson. The President had written:

> The Constitution of the United States—What it does not authorize, is forbidden to those who act under it. . . . When taxes produce more money than can be rightfully applied, the appropriate remedy is reduction or repeal. To continue a tax without necessity for the sake of distribution, is to subvert the principle of the constitution, and must end in destroying the liberties of the people.[58]

The Whigs were only partially satisfied with the deposit bill. They still demanded permanent distribution. The Whigs had gained great strength by championing distribution. It was a popular measure, especially in the West where internal improvements were desperately needed. The Whigs' ability to connect distribution with the state's need for internal improvements made it seem a panacea for all the state's ills; it could make possible a fine transportation system, good schools, and yet it would not require one cent of additional taxes. The Democrats argued that distribution meant high tariff and that it was unconstitutional, but these arguments could not remove from them the odium of attempting to block a popular measure. In North Carolina, more than any other measure, it was the refusal to support annual distribution that caused the downfall of the Democratic party.[59]

Although the question of distribution is not as dramatic as Jackson's militant stand against nullification or his bitter fight with the United States Bank, it is even more important! Had Jackson followed the popular current he would have accepted annual distribution. He would thus have retained within his party not only thousands of Western North Carolinians, who desperately needed funds for road building purposes, but tens of thousands throughout the nation. The decision of Andrew Jackson to oppose annual distribution made it possible for the scheming Whig leaders to have a popular issue that would appeal to the masses.

Not only was Jackson's opposition to annual distribution important in shifting political alignments, but it was vital in retaining the original concept of American federal government. Had Jackson supported annual distribution the United States would soon have become a truly national government rather than a federal government of limited powers. The central government would have become the supplier of funds that could have been used to aid all the people. The nation would not have

[57] Tarboro *Free Press*, July 30, 1836.

[58] Andrew Jackson to Henry Horn and Henry Simpson, June 26, 1836, quoted in Tarboro *Free Press*, August 6, 1836.

[59] William S. Hoffmann, "Downfall of the Democrats: The Reaction of North Carolinians to Jacksonian Land Policy," *North Carolina Historical Review*, XXIII (April, 1956), 166-180.

waited one century for Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal before becoming a welfare state.

Neither Andrew Jackson nor Martin Van Buren opposed annual distribution because they assumed such a stand would gain votes. Bedford Brown, Dr. Thomas Hall, and the other North Carolinians who opposed distribution realized that their stand would not be popular.[60] Jackson and his followers had sworn to obey the constitution, and their interpretation would not allow the central government to give funds to the states. To Southeastern and Northeastern Democrats the decision to oppose annual distribution was a decision to defend the constitution.

In North Carolina and in the majority of the nation the Whig championship of annual distribution was popular. As Whig politicians held meetings to select electors for the coming presidential contest, they declared, "The measure of first magnitude is distribution of the proceeds of *public lands*."[61] They cited a letter by Hugh Lawson White to show that he favored the policy, and a letter by Van Buren to prove his opposition. The Whigs had their issue and it was a popular one. As long as distribution remained the vital issue of the campaign the Whigs were in a favorable position, but when they shifted their emphasis to personalities and to sectionalism they were on less secure ground.

[60] Bedford Brown to Martin Van Buren, October 11, 1836, McPherson, "Letters to Martin Van Buren," 69.
[61] Hillsboro *Recorder*, October 28, 1836.

CHAPTER XI

THE GREAT CRUSADE FOR AN UNPOPULAR CANDIDATE

> "Martin Van Buren, an abolitionist and Richard M. Johnson, an amalgamationist. . . . It would be more congenial to their habits and conformable to their principles—the one to preside over the destinies of Liberia, the other to multiply and increase his subjects."
>
> John B. Thompson,
> toast at Onslow Whig banquet[1]

> "The people now see that White has no chance to be elected, and they will not throw votes away on him to help *Harrison*—a man who . . . longs to see the day when the sun will not shine on a negro slave."
>
> Tarboro *Free Press*[2]

The election of 1836 was unique in American history. It was the only election in which a political party deliberately ran more than one presidential candidate. The Democrats had a national candidate, who was not especially popular in any section of the country; the Whigs had three sectional candidates: one to run in the South, one to run in parts of New England, one to run in the remainder of the East and in the Northwest. Supporters of each of the Whig candidates could appeal to the people of one region and tell them that the rival candidate was an enemy of their section. As 1836 dawned the two parties had about equal strength. The presidential contest of 1836 was not a national election, but a series of state campaigns.

In North Carolina the people were about evenly divided between the two parties. In the state, as in the nation, the great personal popularity of Andrew Jackson gave the Democrats an important advantage, but North Carolina Whigs had many factors in their favor.[3] They were known as the champions of distribution; they had more strong party journals than their rivals; and especially in the West, they had more popular political leaders supporting their cause. North Carolina was considered a doubtful state, and in many respects the state campaign was typical of the nation.

There were many candidates considered by the Whigs of North

[1] Raleigh *Register,* September 20, 1836, quoting the New Bern *Spectator.*
[2] November 5, 1836.
[3] Willie P. Mangum to David L. Swain, December 22, 1833, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* II, 52.

Carolina. Henry Clay was the original favorite of the National Republicans, but national party strategy kept Clay from entering the race.[4] Nullifiers led by Charles Fisher wanted to nominate John C. Calhoun, but Willie P. Mangum succeeded in convincing them that Calhoun's unpopularity would throw North Carolina into the Van Buren camp.[5] In the fall of 1834 the *Register* and the *Carolina Watchman* suggested that a state convention nominate a "Southern candidate," but the New Bern *Spectator* and the *Western Carolinian* warned that such a nomination might divide the party so the convention was never held.[6] The *Western Carolinian* seconded a New York paper's nomination of Willie P. Mangum, and the Fayetteville *Observer* named William Gaston as a suitable candidate.[7] James Graham wanted the state to support Democrat Thomas Ruffin, and he felt that if Ruffin could secure an appointment as Secretary of the Treasury he would be able to defeat Van Buren. Democratic manager Romulus M. Saunders was working to secure the post for Judge Ruffin for other reasons, but Jackson named another person to the position.[8] The one candidate who won general approval from the Whigs was Hugh Lawson White.

White was acceptable to all factions of the party. In September, 1834, the *Western Carolinian* commented favorably on his nomination, but the *Standard* inaccurately declared that White was a loyal Democrat and would not allow himself to be used by the "bank-Tory party."[9] In January, 1835, the Alabama legislature nominated White and soon the Whig press was filled with praise of the Tennessee Senator.[10] On April 3, 1835, citizens at Statesville held a meeting, declared that a Southerner should be president, and recommended Hugh Lawson White.[11] Similar meetings followed in other towns. The *Register,* dropping its nationalism to accept the tone of the Branch group, declared, "The cause of Judge White is the cause of the South."[12] On December 22, 1835, at Raleigh, Whig legislators and others held a meeting and nominated White.[13] As 1836 opened, Whigs in almost every county were holding meetings to select delegates to name electors pledged to White.

[4] Raleigh *Register,* October 22, 1833; New Bern *Spectator,* March 15, 1833.
[5] Willie P. Mangum to John Beard, Philadelphia, October 7, 1834, Fisher Papers.
[6] Raleigh *Register,* September 2, 1834, quoting the Salisbury *Carolina Watchman,* September 30, 1834, quoting the New Bern *Spectator;* Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* September 20, 1834.
[7] Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* September 30, December 6, 1834, quoting the Fayetteville *Observer.*
[8] James Graham to W. A. Graham, Washington, January 5, 1834, W. A. Graham Papers, University of North Carolina; Romulus Saunders to Thomas Ruffin, October 15, November 4, 1833, *Thomas Ruffin Papers,* II, 98, 105-107.
[9] Raleigh *Standard,* December 26, 1834; Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* September 27, 1834.
[10] Raleigh *Register,* February 2, 1835.
[11] Raleigh *Register,* April 14, 1835.
[12] Raleigh *Register,* December 22, 1835.
[13] Raleigh *Register,* December 29, 1835.

The Democrats also began the contest early. In February, 1835, the *Standard* called on all Democrats to support the candidate of the Baltimore Convention.[14] As they had in 1832, the enemies of Van Buren assailed the national convention. The Whig press called it a "caucus of officeholders" and made the phrase a greatly overworked cliche.[15] Sometimes in their county and district conventions which met to select delegates to the convention, the Democrats also named presidential electors. Nathaniel Macon accepted a nomination to serve on the electoral ticket, and his name was an advantage to the party. The Democrats were not going to lose the election through lack of energy.

Most of the state's Van Buren men preferred William C. Rives of Virginia as their candidate for vice-president. In late 1834 the *North Carolina Sentinel* named Rives as its choice.[16] Romulus Saunders and Robert Strange, leaders of the state delegation at the national convention, both favored the Virginian. At the convention Strange proposed that a two-thirds majority be required for a nomination, and the convention accepted his measure. Saunders and Strange persuaded the minority of the state delegation to vote for Rives on the first ballot, and the Rives men promised to support the nominee of the convention. On the first ballot Richard M. Johnson received four votes more than the necessary two-thirds and won the vice-presidential nomination. Saunders admitted that he personally preferred Rives, but he made a strong plea for all Democrats to accept the Van Buren-Johnson ticket. The *Standard,* whose editor had also favored Rives, likewise gave Johnson wholehearted support.[17]

The state meeting which had nominated Hugh Lawson White had failed to name a vice-presidential candidate. Shortly after North Carolina made her nomination, Maryland Whigs also nominated White and named John Tyler as his running mate. Tyler accepted the nomination, and North Carolina Whig leaders then added Tyler's name to their ticket. Many Whig meetings passed resolutions praising Tyler greatly. Meanwhile the Democrats had gained control of the Virginia legislature and instructed Tyler and his colleague to support the expunging resolution. Tyler refused, but, unlike Willie P. Mangum, he accepted the doctrine of instruction and resigned. The *Register* called his resignation "the strongest rebuke to Whig principles," and called on those who approved Mangum's course to revoke Tyler's nomination[18] The *Star* supported Tyler, and although many Whigs hoped he would withdraw,

[14] Raleigh *Standard,* February 13, 1835.
[15] Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* May 16, 1836. The phrase appears four times on one page.
[16] Raleigh *Standard,* January 2, 1835, quoting the New Bern *North Carolina Sentinel.*
[17] Raleigh *Standard,* June 5, 1835.
[18] Raleigh *Register,* March 8, 1836; Weston R. Gales to Willie P. Mangum, January 22, 1836, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* II, 381.

few were willing to follow the *Register's* suggestion and revoke the nomination. Editor Weston Gales, calling Tyler's resignation an honest error, acquiesced in the Virginian's continuance on the ticket.[19] The vice-presidency was not very important.

The North Carolina Whigs were more concerned with selecting a popular candidate for governor than for vice president. Four candidates were prominently mentioned. The Oxford *Examiner* suggested that Mangum be the party's candidate, but he was vulnerable on several accounts and did not make the race.[20] The *Carolina Watchman* named ex-Federalist William B. Meares of New Hanover County, but the Whigs of that county felt Edward B. Dudley would be a stronger candidate.[21] The National Republican wing of the party preferred Meares, but it realized that his Federalism would make him vulnerable and accepted Dudley as a stronger candidate.[22] Thomas Polk was the strongest western candidate, but he made a plea for party unity and stepped aside in favor of Dudley.[23] The *Register* called for a meeting of White's supporters to make a nomination for governor, and the assemblage unanimously named Edward B. Dudley as its candidate.[24]

Dudley accepted the nomination and showed that he intended to make sectional opposition to Van Buren the chief issue of the campaign. In his letter of acceptance he declared: "Mr. Van Buren is not one of us. He is a Northern man . . . in soul, in principle, and in action."[25] He said that Van Buren was an abolitionist who had supported the anti-slavery provisions of the Missouri Compromise and had granted Congress the power to abolish slavery. Dudley had been a member of the Branch group in 1832, and he intended to repeat the charges made during the ill-fated Barbour campaign. He was advised to tour the state, tell anecdotes of his service in the War of 1812, and avoid controversial issues.[26] He traveled widely, spoke at public banquets, and carried on an active campaign. His early championship of state internal improvements and his campaign pleas for public education aided his candidacy.[27]

The Democrats attacked Dudley on several counts. Lauchlin Bethune

[19] Raleigh *Register,* March 22, 1836; James Simmons to Willie P. Mangum, March 9, 1836, Robert Gilliam to Willie P. Mangum, April 1, 1836, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* II, 403, 417.
[20] Raleigh *Standard,* December 15, 1835.
[21] Raleigh *Standard,* March 10, 1836; Raleigh *Register,* November 3, 1835, quoting the Salisbury *Carolina Watchman.*
[22] Weston Gales to Willie P. Mangum, January 22, 1836, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* II, 381.
[23] Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* January 16, 1836.
[24] Raleigh *Register,* January 26, February 9, 1836.
[25] Edward B. Dudley to Weston Gales and others, February 17, 1836, Raleigh *Register,* February 23, 1836.
[26] James Graham to W. A. Graham, Washington, February 7, 1836, W. A. Graham Papers, University of North Carolina.
[27] Raleigh *Register,* June 30, 1836, quoting the New Bern *Spectator.*

called a Democratic meeting in Fayetteville and denounced Dudley's letter of acceptance as "illiberal, anti-republican, unconstitutional in spirit, and insulting to the pride and patriotism of the state."[28] The Democrats charged that Dudley was deliberately stirring up sectional hostility.[29] They published a letter Dudley had written in 1830 opposing forceful removal of two thousand Cherokees from North Carolina. They twisted his words and averred that he "thought it the duty of all poor men in North Carolina to give their daughters in marriage to the Indian savage."[30] Only Democratic partisans could believe such an absurd charge, and Dudley was not harmed by the publication of the letter.

The Democrats had little choice in naming a candidate. Their party in the legislature had just selected Richard Dobbs Spaight for governor, and they were virtually forced to recommend his reelection. In March the *Standard* endorsed his nomination as "springing spontaneously . . . from the Democracy of the state."[31] Spaight was a poor campaigner. He refused invitations to public banquets and did not travel extensively over the state; he was trying to create the illusion that he would neither seek nor decline public office.[32] Most candidates tried to make their entrance into a campaign appear as a reluctant willingness to serve, but in the case of avid office seeker Richard Dobbs Spaight it was most ineffective.

Spaight was extremely vulnerable in the congressional district which was composed of Rutherford, Buncombe, Burke, Haywood, Macon, and Yancey counties. He was linked with David Newland, the unsuccessful candidate in the congressional election of 1835. The state law required voters to cast their ballots in the county of their residence, and Newland secured depositions to prove that many of Graham's votes came from people voting outside their county. Newland carried his evidence to Washington and gave indications that if the presidential election was to be decided by the House of Representatives he would vote for Van Buren. Many people believed that Daniel Webster, William Henry Harrison, and White would receive enough electoral votes to throw the election to the House and that Graham's vote could keep Van Buren from becoming president. The Democrats had a majority in the House and voted to unseat Graham.[33] Their action appeared to Whigs and non-partisans as an unjust political decision made only to aid Van Buren's presidential ambitions; but if the election had gone to the House, a pledge by Augustine H. Shepperd to vote with his district

[28] Fayetteville *Observer,* March 24, 1836.
[29] Raleigh *Standard,* March 3, 1836.
[30] "One of the People" in Raleigh *Register,* September 6, 1836, quoting the Rutherfordton *Gazette.*
[31] Raleigh *Standard,* March 10, 1836.
[32] Raleigh *Standard,* March 31, 1836.
[33] Raleigh *Register,* March 8, 1836.

would have caused North Carolina's vote to be given to Van Buren.[34] Fifteen Democrats refused to seat Newland, and he failed to win the coveted post. The House requested the governor to call a special election, but instead of calling it immediately Spaight issued a call to make the congressional election coincide with the general election. The people of the district blamed the Democratic governor because they had no representative.[35]

The Democrats had made a strategic error. The Whigs charged that Newland had persuaded Spaight to delay the election. They asserted that Newland realized he had no chance to win immediately, but if the election was deferred the aid of the Democratic party would give him a better opportunity.[36] Newland's action was very unpopular in the district, and the Democrats suffered by linking their cause with his. Some Democrats promised Graham their vote because they said they could not "stand a turncoat."[37] Newland realized his own unpopularity and considered withdrawing, while Graham's popularity increased with four months of strenuous campaigning.[38] Graham won by a majority of 1,614 votes, and Spaight received 1,491 fewer votes than Dudley.[39] In 1835 the district had sent a Democratic majority to the legislature, but in the August election the people elected ten Whigs and only four Democrats.[40] A part of the shift was caused by the revision of the constitution which increased the representation of the Whig strongholds of Burke, Rutherford, and Buncombe counties, but the roles of Newland and Spaight in the contested election proved disastrous to the Democrats.

Although his greatest victory was in the mountain area, Edward B. Dudley showed great strength throughout the state. He defeated Spaight by approximately five thousand votes. He trailed in the East by about three thousand votes, but had an eight thousand majority in the West.[41] The Whigs considered Dudley's victory a great party triumph, but it was due in large part to personal popularity and active campaigning.[42] Edward B. Dudley ran well ahead of his party.

In the contests for the state legislature almost every candidate cam-

[34] Tarboro *Free Press,* September 3, 1836; Ebenezer Pettigrew to Jonh H. Bryan, March 24, 1836, John H. Bryan Collection, Papers, III.

[35] James Graham to W. A. Graham, Washington, April 4, 1836, W. A. Graham Papers, University of North Carolina; Raleigh *Standard,* April 14, 1836.

[36] Raleigh *Register,* September 6, 1836, quoting the Fayetteville *Observer.*

[37] James Graham to W. A. Graham, Rutherfordton, May 7, 1836, W. A. Graham Papers, University of North Carolina.

[38] Joseph W. D. Graham to W. A. Graham, Elm Wood Farm, April 21, 1836, James Graham to W. A. Graham, Washington, May 7, 1836, W. A. Graham Papers, University of North Carolina.

[39] Raleigh *Register,* August 23, November 22, 1836.

[40] James Graham to W. A. Graham, Rutherfordton, August 20, 1836, W. A. Graham Papers, University of North Carolina.

[41] Raleigh *Register,* November 22, 1836.

[42] Raleigh *Register,* September 6, 1836

paigned on national issues. Personal popularity still played an important part, but comparatively few men won elections in counties which disapproved their national stand. Both parties had put forth great efforts to carry the legislature. County meetings named candidates as friends of White or Van Buren, and both parties made every effort to get the strongest candidates to make the race.[43] Campaigning was arduous, and there were few men able to sit back and win on their reputations. If the old constitution had not been amended the Democrats would have won a sizable majority, and the provision which gave each county at least one member of the House of Commons still left them a slight advantage. The Whigs had a majority of two in the Senate, while the Democrats had the same majority in the House.[44] The August elections were a slight victory for the Whig party, but by no means gave a clear indication that the people of the state strongly opposed Martin Van Buren.

The Whigs nevertheless claimed that Dudley's victory was positive proof that Judge White would carry the state. They placed more emphasis on Dudley's charge that Van Buren was an abolitionist and consequently lessened their association with distribution. The Democrats were more accurate in their analysis. Bedford Brown wrote Van Buren that Spaight's defeat was due in part to local causes, in part to Democratic opposition to distribution, but was especially due to "the gross falsehoods spread abroad as to the motives of Democrats who unseated Graham." Brown had high hopes for victory in November and promised: "Our party . . . will go to the contest, without that sanguine expectation, of success, which often proves fatal . . . and, at the same time, without despondence, which discourages exertion."[45]

The Whigs tried their utmost to portray Van Buren as an enemy of the South. They charged that the one principle upon which "he has always acted" was "opposition to Southern interests."[46] In public meetings Whig partisans declared that he had supported DeWitt Clinton instead of James Madison in 1812. They pointed to his vote on the tariff of 1828 and called him a champion of protection. They pointed to his vote to extend the Cumberland road and called him an advocate of federal internal improvements. The Whig editors declared he had supported free Negro suffrage in New York.[47] The Democrats answered that Van Buren was a moderate on the tariff issue and was an

[43] Hillsboro *Recorder,* February 29, August 16, 23, 30, 1836; Lewis Williams to W. A. Graham, Washington, April 1, 1836, W. A. Graham Papers, University of North Carolina.

[44] Tarboro *Free Press,* August 27, 1836.

[45] Bedford Brown to Martin Van Buren, October 11, 1836, McPherson, "Letters to Van Buren," 70.

[46] Raleigh *Register,* August 2, 1836, quoting the Charlotte *Miners and Farmers Journal.*

[47] Raleigh *Register,* February 16, 1836; Hillsboro *Recorder,* October 26, 1836.

enemy of internal improvements. They charged that Judge White was a friend of the free Negro and in 1823 had placed his arms around one and led him to the ballot box.[48] The Democratic organ insisted that Van Buren had worked to curtail free Negro voting, and all of his views were in "accordance with the interest of slaveholders."[49]

The Whigs declared that on the subject of slavery a candidate "must not only agree with us," but "like Caesar's wife," be "above suspicion."[50] To prove Van Buren not above suspicion they wrote letters asking the two candidates to state their position on abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. White, as expected, declared Congress had no power to abolish slavery in the District.[51] Van Buren called abolition in the District inexpedient and declared that it would violate the spirit of the agreement between the federal government and the states of Maryland and Virginia. He wrote, "The slave question must be left to the slave holding states themselves without molestation . . . from any quarter."[52] He would not say that Congress had no constitutional power to interfere. The Whigs used the negative phrase as a basis of their declaration that Van Buren conceded the power to emancipate, and they asserted that his views differed none "from Tappan, Garrison, and Company."[53]

The Whigs charged Van Buren's running mate with a sin worse than abolition. It was well known that Johnson lived with a Negro mistress, but the Whigs were not satisfied merely to charge him with immorality. They constantly denounced him as an amalgamationist, and toward the close of the campaign Starling Gunn issued a circular emphasizing Johnson's private life. He charged that Johnson's moral character was

> stained by the deepest and blackest vices known to moral law. For while others merely insist in theory upon the equality of blacks with the whites and the propriety of amalgamating the two races, he has reduced their principles to practice by taking to his embraces a NEGRO WENCH, and making her the wife of his bosom and the mother of his children.[54]

The circular made the rounds of the press but did the Democratic ticket little harm. The Whigs had failed to learn that excessive per-

[48] Raleigh *Standard,* November 10, 1836.
[49] Raleigh *Standard,* July 10, 1835.
[50] Raleigh *Register,* August 2, 1836, quoting the Charlotte *Miners and Farmers Journal.*
[51] Hugh Lawson White to John Timberlake and others, May 2, 1836, Raleigh *Register,* June 14, 1836.
[52] Martin Van Buren to Junius Amis and others, March 6, 1836, Tarboro *Free Press,* March 26, 1836.
[53] Raleigh *Register,* July 5, 1836, quoting the Halifax *Minerva.*
[54] Starling Gunn, "To the Voters of Caswell County," Hillsboro *Recorder* October 21, 1836.

sonal abuse does the dispenser more harm than good; the voters of Gunn's county cast 1,067 votes for Van Buren and Johnson and only 116 for White and Tyler.[55] In North Carolina the questionable sex life of the vice-presidential candidate cost the Democrats few votes.

While the Whigs were doing their utmost to arouse sectional feeling against the "abolitionist and the amalgamationist," the Democrats were preaching love of union. They associated the Whigs with the nullifiers; and almost every well-known North Carolinian who had sympathized with nullification was supporting Hugh Lawson White. They asserted that White's supporters wanted a pretext to dissolve the Union.[56] Bedford Brown urged voters not to accept the sectional candidate and allow the opposition to divide North and South. He declared that only through "Republican ascendancy" had the "Union been preserved," and he pleaded with all loyal citizens to support the union candidate.[57]

Hard money was an important issue for the Democrats. Gold mining ranked high among North Carolina's industries,[58] and in 1834 the Democratic congress passed a law to mint gold dollars. This act was very popular in North Carolina, and the Democrats declared that the law showed that the administration had provided more stable currency than the "rag currency" of the national bank.[59] The Whigs asserted that gold coinage was less practical than United States bank notes, yet they admitted that the act would uphold the price of North Carolina gold.[60]

In the winter of 1835 Thomas Hart Benton introduced a bill to establish three mints in the South, one to be at Charlotte, the center of North Carolina's gold mining region. This would mean much to the people of the area; gold could be sold directly to the mint with less danger of theft; transportation expenses would be lessened; and a ready market was to be always available. While the bill was before Congress the *Standard* told readers that Democrats were trying to secure passage of the bill while Whigs were trying to defeat it. Both Willie P. Mangum and Bedford Brown made speeches defending the bill, and it became law. The *Register* insisted that southern Whigs were responsible for passage of the law, and the *Western Carolinian* gave Calhoun the credit. The *Standard* showed that in the Senate thirteen of the seventeen Democrats supported the bill, while only ten of the twenty-five Whigs gave it their vote. As the election drew near the mint was almost ready to begin operation; the Democrats commented favorably on

[55] Raleigh *Register,* November 22, 1836.
[56] Raleigh *Standard,* November 10, 1836.
[57] Bedford Brown to James Rainey and others, September 17, 1836, Tarboro *Free Press,* September 21, 1836.
[58] Fletcher M. Green, "Gold Mining: A Forgotten Industry of Ante-Bellum North Carolina," *North Carolina Historical Review,* XIV (January, 1937), 3.
[59] Raleigh *Standard,* February 11, 1836.
[60] Salisbury *Carolina Watchman,* July 12, 1834.

the developments of the institution and reminded readers that their party had brought it to North Carolina.[61]

Toward the close of the campaign the Democrats loudly warned against the possibility of an election by the House of Representatives. In early October they issued a pamphlet emphasizing that if the people of North Carolina voted for Hugh Lawson White they would be "doing all that is in their power to do towards preventing an *election of President by the People*."[62] They pointed out that 148 electoral votes were needed to win the election, and even if White should carry every state where he was running he would receive only 94 votes. They asserted that the Whigs had no intention of electing White President, and argued that if the new president were elected by the House he would owe his election, not to the people, but to politicians at Washington. Almost every issue of the *Standard* denounced the "pie-bald party," and insisted that the Whigs had made a "tool" of "poor dottering old Judge White" in order to transfer the election to the House.[63]

During the final month of the campaign Democrats "exposed" a plan of North Carolina Whigs to transfer the vote of the state to William Henry Harrison. Joseph Seawell Jones, a young man who liked to exaggerate his own importance, was visiting in New York City and attended a banquet honoring Harrison. Jones announced that North Carolina Whigs would support Harrison if White could not be elected. An observer reported his comment to a New York newspaper, and North Carolina Democrats spotted the notice and gave it wide publicity. The *Standard* identified Jones as a historian who had violently denounced Jefferson and hence was good company for the "federalist-Whigs." Editor Philo White asked:

> Will the . . . Whigs and Nullifiers of North Carolina thank this . . . representative for letting "the cat out of the wallet"—for blabbing forth over his cups what his fellow Whigs at home are making such efforts to conceal—for revealing the secret that the nullifiers and their allies . . . are ready and willing to go for Harrison, the notorious emancipationist, the tariffite and corruption bank advocate? . . . That Mr. Jones while puffed up with flattery and mellowed with wine has told the truth about his party, every intelligent politician . . . knows full well.[64]

White concluded that Jones' remarks constituted positive proof that Whig electors intended to vote for Harrison.

[61] Raleigh *Standard,* February 20, March 6, 27, 1835, January 28, 1836; Raleigh *Register,* March 18, 1835; Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* April 25, 1835.

[62] William H. Haywood, Jr. and others, "An Address to the Freemen of N. Carolina," quoted in Tarboro *Free Press,* October 15, 1836.

[63] Raleigh *Standard,* October 13, 1836.

[64] Raleigh *Standard,* November 3, 1836. Jones was the author of *A Defence of the Revolutionary History of the State of North Carolina from the Aspersions of Mr. Jefferson,* Raleigh, 1834.

The Whig Central Committee denounced the *Standard's* charge as "a Base Calumny, wholly destitute of truth."[65] But the damage was already done. Even had Jones not "let the cat out of the wallet," it was logical that Harrison would be the second choice of the Whigs, and many intelligent non-partisans realized that to vote for White would increase the likelihood of Harrison or Webster becoming president. Although Harrison was no more of an abolitionist than Van Buren he too was a northern man, and the sectional prejudice which the Whigs had tried so hard to arouse was greatly lessened. The Democrats had presented convincing arguments that White could not be elected. The North Carolina Whigs had made no effort to sell Harrison to the people, and many voters who preferred White to Van Buren stayed away from the polls instead of casting a vote which would make the election of Harrison more likely.

Almost ten thousand fewer people voted in November than had voted in August. By a vote of 26,910 to 23,626 the people of North Carolina voted for Van Buren electors.[66] The Whigs blamed apathy and overconfidence for their defeat and insisted that "party drilling" was responsible for the Democratic victory.[67] The Democrats did have an effective organization, but no better than their rivals. The realization that White could not possibly be elected by the people was partially responsible for Van Buren's success. Another important factor was that a large percentage of the voters in North Carolina were unwilling to follow a sectional party; and Van Buren's victory, in a sense, was a triumph of unionism over sectionalism. Yet in spite of Van Buren's victory there were more Whigs than Democrats in the state.

In a few weeks the Democrats won another important victory. Senator Willie P. Mangum's term had only a few more months to run. Following Edward B. Dudley's victory Mangum said that he would have resigned had the people voted Democratic, and accepting Van Buren's victory as a mandate from the people he finally resigned. The legislature had been evenly divided, but John Muse, Whig member of the House of Commons from Pasquotank County, resigned, and a Democrat won the special election to fill the vacancy.[68] William Haywood, Jr., and Robert Strange sought the Democratic nomination for senator, and a party caucus selected Strange.[69] The Whigs considered nominating William Moseley, a popular Democrat, in order to divide their

[65] Raleigh *Register,* November 8, 1836.
[66] William Ogden Niles, ed., *Niles Weekly Register,* 70 vols. (Baltimore: William Ogden Niles, December 10, 1836), LI, 228.
[67] Raleigh *Register,* November 29, 1836.
[68] Raleigh *Register,* December 6, 1836.
[69] Henry G. Spruill to Ebenezer Pettigrew, Raleigh, November 25, 1836, Pettigrew Papers, VII, 55.

opponents, but the plan did not materialize.[70] The Democrats stood together and by one vote they elected Strange to fill Mangum's unexpired term.[71] A few weeks later by a straight party vote Strange defeated John Owen and won the election for a full senatorial term.[72]

Except for the senator and for members of the Council of State the Democrats did not vote as a party. Of five Superior Court judges elected, only one was a Democrat, and he resigned. Whigs won most of the lesser offices and showed more tendency to vote together than did their rivals.[73] In selecting minor state offices the Whigs showed more partisan bias than did the Democrats.

The main question before the legislature concerned the use of the federal government's deposit. The Whigs wanted to use it to purchase stock in the new state bank and in North Carolina's proposed railroads. Dividends from the stock would be used to aid education.[74] At first the Democrats insisted that the money must be placed in safe keeping to be returned to the federal government when requested.[75] Dr. Thomas Hall, then in the state Senate, even protested against accepting the fund[76]. Hall was in the minority; the funds were accepted.

A non-partisan committee headed by William A. Graham reported a bill recommending a modified version of the Whig plan. Speaker William Haywood, the main Democratic spokesman, had previously indicated his disapproval of investing the surplus funds in speculative enterprises, but he suddenly introduced a substitute bill that proposed to use the money in a way that was no safer than the Whig proposal. He suggested that a part of the money be used to retire the public debt, some be invested in railroads, and a sizable part be used to drain swamps or build canals. The swamp draining and canal building projects were to be managed by the Board of Internal Improvements, and they were to be carried out in such a way as to make worthless lands owned by the state become valuable. The proceeds from the state land sales would be used to aid education. Most of the Democrats were willing to follow their House leader, and with some modifications Haywood's plan became law.[77] It was the beginning of a state system of education and internal improvements. Yet despite Haywood and his Democratic supporters the Whigs took sole credit for fathering the system.

With the end of the legislative session of 1836-1837, Democratic dominance ended. The Whigs had learned a lesson from their defeat

[70] John Taylor to Willie P. Mangum, November 24, 1836, *Willie P. Mangum Papers,* II, 481.
[71] Raleigh *Standard,* November 30, 1836.
[72] Tarboro *Free Press,* December 24, 1836.
[73] Raleigh *Register,* December 27, 1836, January 3, 10, 1837.
[74] Raleigh *Register,* November 29, 1836
[75] Richard Dobbs Spaight's Annual Message, Raleigh *Standard,* November 24, 1836.
[76] Raleigh *Standard,* December 15, 1836.
[77] Raleigh *Register,* January 3, 17, 24, 1837.

in the presidential election of 1836. In the future they were to drop their southern nationalism and express more devotion to the union than the rival party. They continued to champion distribution and the national bank. Such tactics served them well, and the Democrats did not again carry the state in a presidential election until 1856. The Whigs retained the governorship until 1850. In 1840 the Whigs gained both seats in the United States Senate, and, except for a short interval between 1843 and 1846, no Democrat again served served in the Senate until 1854. For about fifteen years the Whigs were the dominant party in the state.

CHAPTER XII

EVALUATION AND CONCLUSIONS

In the twelve years between 1824 and 1836 many changes had been made in the politics of the state and nation. From a system of factionalism and personal politics emerged two organized and well disciplined political parties. Andrew Jackson's great popularity was a minor factor in causing the transition to the two party system. In the presidential election of 1824 the people showed their indifference toward national affairs and only a small number voted. But a majority of the voters who went to the polls favored Andrew Jackson because he had defeated the British at New Orleans and had given the United States the greatest victory in its military annals. The politicians who conducted Jackson's campaign were an ill-assorted group that included some real supporters of Jackson, some whose first loyalty was to John C. Calhoun, and others who despised democratic principles and were Federalist to the core. Practically all were opportunists trying to ride to political victory on the coat-tails of "Old Hickory."

The supporters of rival candidate, William H. Crawford, gave the Georgian their votes because he was the regular Republican candidate. Most of them believed in the basic Republican principles of a limited federal government and considered Crawford the candidate most likely to follow their beliefs. During the four years after the election most of them accepted Jackson as a lesser evil than John Quincy Adams. In the election of 1828 the adherents of Jackson won an easy victory, but the result simply showed that the people preferred a military hero to a politician who had made his reputation in the diplomatic field.

Jackson's policies during his first term in office generally satisfied the people of North Carolina and all Americans who clung to the early ideals of Thomas Jefferson. The politicians who had once supported Crawford became "Old Hickory's" strongest supporters. In early 1832 some of the early supporters of Jackson were enemies of Martin Van Buren and the Old Republican wing of the party, and they cooperated with many of the original anti-Jackson men to form a faction pledged to Jackson and Philip P. Barbour. The former supporters of Crawford combined with some original Jackson adherents to carry the state for Jackson and Van Buren. The 1832 election proved decisively that Jackson still had the admiration of the people, and it also showed that the people rejected southern nationalism and had great love for the union. In 1834 when all the enemies of Jackson and Van Buren became

the Whigs, Democrats forgot differences over state issues and likewise emerged as a real political party.

The greatest Democratic strength in North Carolina was in the north-central counties and in the East. Although in 1824 Jacksonianism had been primarily a western movement, by 1834 most of the important Democratic leaders were Easterners, and the personal influence of these leaders helped the party retain its eastern majority. Generally the districts where slavery was most prominent were safely Democratic. These districts had generally supported strict construction and governmental economy, and the people saw that the Democrats more nearly followed these principles than did the Whigs. Despite their abhorence of nullification the voters of these districts had a real economic need for low tariff, and hence were less likely to approve distribution or follow the party of Henry Clay and Daniel Webster. The Democratic party was the party of moderation.

The men who opposed Jackson in 1828 became the nucleus of an anti-Jackson party. This was true throughout the South.[1] In North Carolina politics before 1832 they were allied with many Jackson men, and nothing like a two party system existed. The most significant factor in the evolution of the Whig party was the dismissal of John Branch. The crafty politician organized a faction which was not openly anti-Jackson but was determined to defeat Van Buren. A large number of pro-Jackson politicians and editors, especially those who had been partisans of Calhoun, showed a willingness to join Branch's group, and the original anti-Jackson men at first seemed inclined to follow his lead. Because of the association of some of Branch's faction with nullification the people refused to follow the group, and as the nullification controversy reached its height, original anti-Jackson men drew away and proclaimed themselves champions of militant nationalism. Two years later Jackson's removal of the deposits from the national bank served as a pretext for both groups to proclaim openly their opposition to Andrew Jackson, and the Whig party was formed. The Whig party was composed of all the politicians who for various reasons opposed Jackson. In North Carolina the Whigs included the most ardent nationalists and the most extreme advocates of state sovereignty. Before 1837 it was the party of extremism.

The greatest strength of the Whigs was in the West. Distribution was very popular in that section, and disapproval of the Democrats' motives in unseating James Graham had greatly strengthened the Whig party. The Democrats had no strong western press to rival the *Western Carolinian* and the *Carolina Watchman* and few influential politicians to rival Charles Fisher, David Caldwell, Lewis Williams,

[1] Charles G. Sellers, "Who Were the Southern Whigs?" *American Historical Review*, LIX (January, 1954), 335-346.

William J. Alexander, David L. Swain, and the two Grahams. Yet party division was not sectional; both parties were well organized throughout the state. The elections of 1836 showed that the parties were of about equal strength. Personal politics had ended and partisanism was the order of the day.

The story of North Carolina politics from 1824 to 1837 is the story of politicians maneuvering to gain or maintain political power. First the politicians acted independently or cooperated with loosely knit factions; finally they worked together in one of two disciplined political parties. Some politicians remained loyal to their political friends; others frequently shifted alliances. Always the politicians were struggling to enable themselves or their group to hold political power.

While the politicians were struggling, important changes were taking place in the life of the people. Perhaps the most significant factor of the Jackson period was that "Old Hickory" captured the interest of the people. The majority of the people of North Carolina loved Jackson, and the personal manner in which the hero attacked his major problems made them look to him as their leader. Jackson's appeals to people made them regard the presidency as the people's office, and in doing so the people became citizens of a nation instead of citizens of states.

In American history Andrew Jackson stands out more for his strong nationalism than for any other reason. During the nullification crisis Jackson might have been more concerned in blocking Calhoun than in saving the union; but regardless of his motivation, when he appealed to the people to save the union they demonstrated their consciousness of a bond of national unity which no previous crisis had shown. Andrew Jackson was still the people's hero, and when he demanded that the union be preserved, the people of North Carolina demonstrated their unionism to a very strong degree. Although the majority of the people of the state had shown that they loved the union and disapproved South Carolina's revolutionary design, they were too firm in their adherence to state rights to approve either the force bill or Jackson's anti-nullification proclamation. Yet because of Jackson's militant attitude they did not break with him or his party.

One of the strange paradoxes in history is that Jackson, whose stand during the nullification crisis was so militantly national, in most respects followed state rights doctrines. In North Carolina this adherence to state's rights endeared him to the people more than anything else except, perhaps, the New Orleans victory. Until 1834 the majority of the people demanded that the national government exert limited powers, and Jackson followed their principles. In his handling of the controversy between Georgia and the Cherokee Indians, and in his vetoes of the Maysville road bill, the recharter of the national bank, and the distribution bill, Jackson was carrying out their concept of a

limited government. In every message, except those issued during the nullification crisis, Jackson went out of his way to reiterate the principles of a federal republic.

About half of the North Carolinians who opposed Jackson denounced him for not respecting state sovereignty. The members of this group were partisans of John C. Calhoun or John Branch. Although they seldom showed consistency, and many changed their principles as frequently as they changed their clothes, there was accuracy in the charge. Neither Jackson nor the Van Buren wing of the party accepted state sovereignty, although they believed in state's rights. To them the federal government had certain specifically delegated powers, and within the sphere of its delegated powers the federal government was supreme. In matters not delegated to the central governmnt, only the states could act. To advocates of state sovereignty the state could make final decision. If a measure was antagonistic to a state the state could abolish it, but if a measure of the federal government might be helpful to a state the constitution should not serve as a barrier to its passage.

The other half of the anti-Jackson coalition was thoroughly national in outlook and attitude. To its members the central government existed to rule and aid all the nation, and they wanted North Carolina to get its share of the good things which federal aid could provide. This National Republican wing of the Whig party was the true successor of the Federalists.

One of the most vehement controversies of the era was Jackson's war on the United States Bank. The actual veto of the recharter bill caused comparatively little outcry in North Carolina, and few politicians deserted the Jackson party over the issue. In 1832 a majority of the people regarded the bank as convenient but unconstitutional and accepted the veto on constitutional grounds.

Yet over the question of transferring the deposits an opposition party arose. The North Carolina Democrats approved Jackson's "motive" in transferring the deposits,[2] but even they were hard pressed to defend the act; and if they could, they would have shifted the issue from the legality of removals to the advisability of rechartering the national bank. In no political quarrel was the personality of Jackson so deeply imbedded as his war against the United States Bank. In North Carolina there was comparatively little feeling that the war on the bank represented the common man's striving to overthrow an entrenched monopoly, the working man's desire to obtain hard money, or an attempt of the liberal capitalist to gain economic equality. Democrats tried to make the bank war a quarrel between the people's hero

[2] William Haywood, Jr., to Andrew Jackson, February 22, 1834, Elizabeth G. McPherson, ed., "Unpublished Letters of North Carolinians to Andrew Jackson," *North Carolina Historical Review,* XIV October, 1937), 382

and a Philadelphia banker, and most of the people who already approved Jackson sustained him during the removal battle. The enemies of Jackson became firmer in their hatred of the Democratic party and its leader. The people of the nation would have been in a better financial position had the national bank remained to partially regulate the economy, but the existence of the institution violated principles of limited government which many people held dear. The bank was undemocratic and was capable of committing great evil.

In North Carolina the fight on the national bank was a political quarrel and had no important economic result. The branch of the United States Bank at Fayetteville was sold to the Bank of the State of North Carolina, and under the same officers and directors it continued operations as a branch of the state bank.[3] In late 1835 the state bank became a depository of federal funds, and by early 1837 it had on deposit from the federal government $728,471.90. Although the Whigs constantly charged that Jackson's administration only deposited funds with "pet banks" controlled by Democratic partisans, the majority of the directors and the major stockholders of the state bank were Whigs.[4] In general the refusal to recharter the national bank and the transfer of deposits encouraged inflation and "wild cat banking," but in North Carolina the chartering of state banks was little affected by the position of the national bank.

During the political quarrels concerning the national bank the doctrine of instructions was used to embarrass partisan enemies. The Whigs began the policy when they arranged for public meetings to instruct Democratic Senator Bedford Brown to support the restoration of the deposits. The Democrats were in a majority of the legislature, and they instructed Whig Senator Willie P. Mangum to support the expunging resolution or resign. In the 1838-1839 General Assembly the Whig majority passed resolutions designed to force Bedford Brown and Robert Strange to resign. The resolution omitted the word instruction, and this allowed the two Democrats to affirm their belief in the right of instruction and delay their resignations until the 1840 legislature assembled. Brown, like Mangum, had surrendered only a few months of his term, but the resignation of Robert Strange meant that he actually served less than four years of his six year term. In 1846 William Haywood, Jr., then Democratic senator, carried the doctrine of instruction one step further. He resigned rather than support a Democratic measure which he personally opposed.[5] Both parties criti-

[3] Raleigh *Register,* October 6, 1835.

[4] Branton B. Holder, "The Three Banks of the State of North Carolina, 1810-1872," (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1937), 314-315.

[5] J. G. deRoulhac Hamilton, *Party Politics in North Carolina, 1835-1860,* Volume XV of *James Sprunt Historical Publications* (Raleigh, 1916), 51-52, 107-109.

cized their rivals for the partisan purposes behind instruction resolutions, but the policy tended to make the Senate a more democratic body and more responsible to the people. Had the doctrine of instruction remained as a practiced political institution the Senate would have been a more democratic body, and perhaps it would have served the people better.

The chief complaint of the people of North Carolina against Andrew Jackson was the refusal of his administration to support distribution. Unlike the opposition to the national bank, opposition to distribution was not so closely connected with Jackson's personality. Van Buren had made a public declaration that the federal government had no constitutional right to distribute funds to the states, and the North Carolina Whigs usually blamed him for the failure of an annual distribution law.[6] This issue changed North Carolina from a Democratic to a Whig state.

A curious paradox in North Carolina history is that in 1830 the people enthusiastically approved Jackson's opposition to federal internal improvements, yet in 1835 they ardently demanded that the federal government distribute funds for states to use on internal improvements. Several factors explain this paradox. The political lineup in 1835 found the majority of editors on the side of the party favoring distribution; the compromise tariff was widely accepted so the proceeds from federal lands virtually constituted surplus revenue. More important is the fact that in 1835 the demand for railroad development was much more ardent than the demand for turnpikes and canals had been five years previously.

Permanent distribution would have aided the people of North Carolina and of the nation. As the Whigs claimed, it would have provided funds to support internal improvement projects, and the improving of transportation would have enabled farmers to market their crops more profitably. Although the prospective railroad and other transportation projects would not have been as profitable as the advocates of distribution claimed, there would have been some profit that could have been used to aid education. The Democratic claim that distribution would result in high tariff was not necessarily true. In 1846 the federal government passed the Walker Tariff, which was comparatively low and designed primarily for revenue purposes. It brought the government ample funds and showed that low rates could bring in more money than rates which were high enough to provide protection. The distribution act of 1836 helped to encourage inflation and was one of the causes of the panic of 1837, but had distribution been continued it would have alleviated the depression. The Whig plan of distribution was a forerunner of federal

[6] Martin Van Buren to Sherrod Williams, quoted in New Bern *Spectator*, September 9, 1836.

aid projects sponsored by the New Deal, the Fair Deal, and the Modern Republicanism of today.

Simultaneous with the discussion of national issues, the people were making important decisions about state issues. North Carolinians revised their constitution, and the revision lessened long standing animosity between East and West. The people gained the right to elect the governor, and the governor was made responsible to the people. In North Carolina and throughout the nation, the white voters were given the right to elect more of their own officials. Free Negroes were disfranchised, but white men were gaining more democratic rights. Yet the Jacksonians as a group were not responsible for the increasing democratic trend.

During the period 1824-1837 many North Carolinians developed strong partisan feelings. In 1824 most of the people considered themselves Republicans and denounced Federalism, but they had little real loyalty to a party. After Jackson became a presidential candidate there was much personal devotion to the man, but no great loyalty to his party. In 1830 a faction formed under the leadership of Richard Dobbs Spaight and called itself the Jackson Republican party, but its members had no monopoly on either Republicanism or support for Jackson. They received some support from the people, but they were an unstable coalition and were soon disrupted. In 1832 the Jackson-Van Buren men tried to rally party feeling behind their electoral ticket, but their success in the election was due more to disapproval of the pro-nullification stand of the Jackson-Barbour men than to party loyalty. Real partisanism began about 1834 and continued unabated throughout the remainder of the period. After that date many people approved all that one party stood for and denounced all that the rival party championed. From 1824 to 1834 the politicians, the editors, and many of the people thought in partisan terms only in the months preceding a presidential election, but after 1834 most politicians, virtually all of the press, and undoubtedly many of the common people acted in a partisan manner practically all of the time. An era of strong partisanism had begun.

Perhaps the most significant change in the life of the people was the way that they felt toward their state. In the late 1820's the state was the political unit to which one gave loyalty, but by the end of Andrew Jackson's administration this was true no longer. The 1830's was the period when southern nationalism began to grow. The partisans of Calhoun, who during the nullification crisis talked so ardently the language of state sovereignty, were not thinking of the abstract right of one state but of the welfare of the whole South. But more important than the development of southern nationalism was the growth of unionism, and in 1837 the majority of people no longer considered

themselves primarily North Carolinians but citizens of the United States of America.

In studying the two party system that developed during Jackson's administration certain conclusions must be made. The Democrats, on the whole, were honest men with a true devotion to principles that they rather consistently followed. They were partisan, but not as partisan as their rivals. The Whigs, generally speaking, were either consistent nationalists or self-seeking opportunists. Most of the party leaders were inconsistent and highly ambitious politicians. They were more underhanded than their rivals. Yet the policies of their party would have served the people better than the limited government concepts of their rivals. The Democrats were honest men who did little good; the Whigs were ambitious schemers whose policies would have been best for the country.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I PRIMARY SOURCES

A Manuscripts

William H. Branch Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

John H. Bryan Collection, Department of Archives and History, Raleigh.

Hutchins G. Burton Papers, Miscellaneous Papers, Department of Archives and History, Raleigh.

Walter Clark Manuscripts, Department of Archives and History, Raleigh.

Edmund Deberry Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Fisher Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

William Gaston Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

William Alexander Graham Papers, Department of Archives and History, Raleigh.

William Alexander Graham Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

James Iredell Papers, George Washington Flowers Collection, Duke University, Durham.

Charles Earl Johnson Collection, Department of Archives and History, Raleigh.

Edmund Jones Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Lenoir Family Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Nathaniel Macon Papers, Department of Archives and History, Raleigh.

Silas McDowell, "History of the Duel between Dr. Vance and S. P. Carson." Typewritten copy, North Carolina Room, University of North Carolina Library, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

Pettigrew Papers, Department of Archives and History, Raleigh, North Carolina.

William Polk Papers, Department of Archives and History, Raleigh.

Robert Strange Paper, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

David L. Swain, Epistolary Correspondence, University of North Carolina Library, Chapel Hill.

David L. Swain Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

North Carolina Letters from the Martin Van Buren Papers, Department of Archives and History, Raleigh.

B Government Documents

Acts of the General Assembly of the State of North Carolina at the Session of 1829-1830. Raleigh: Lawrence and Lemay, 1830.

Acts of the General Assembly of the State of North Carolina at the Session of 1832-1833. Raleigh: Charles R. Ramsay, 1833.

Acts of the General Assembly of the State of North Carolina at the Session of 1833-1834. Raleigh: Lawrence and Lemay, 1834.

Journal of the Senate and House of Commons of the General Assembly of North Carolina at the Session of 1834-1835. Raleigh: Philo White, 1835.

Register of the Debates in Congress, 14 vols. [Serially numbered 43-71.] Washington: Gales and Seaton, 1824-1837.

Richardson, James D., comp., *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789-1897,* 9 vols. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1896.

C Published Correspondence

Bassett, John Spencer, *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson,* 7 vols. Washington: Carnegie Institute, 1928.

Boyd, William K., "Selections from the Correspondence of Bedford Brown," Trinity College Historical Society *Historical Papers,* VI (Durham, 1906), 66-92.

Hamilton, J. G. deRoulhac, "Letters to Bartlett Yancey," *The James Sprunt Historical Publications,* X (Chapel Hill, 1911), 25-76.

———, *The Papers of Thomas Ruffin,* 4 vols. Raleigh: North Carolina Historical Commission, 1918, 1920.

Hoyt, William H., *The Papers of Archibald D. Murphey,* 2 vols. Raleigh: North Carolina Historical Commission, 1914.

McPherson, Elizabeth G., "Unpublished Letters of North Carolinians to Andrew Jackson," *North Carolina Historical Review,* XIV (October, 1937), 361-392.

———, "Unpublished Letters of North Carolinians to James K. Polk," *North Carolina Historical Review,* XVI (January, April, 1939), 54-79, 174-200.

———,"Unpublished Letters of North Carolinians to Martin Van Buren," *North Carolina Historical Review,* XV (January, April, 1938), 53-81, 131-155.

Newsome, Albert R., "Letters of Romulus M. Saunders to Bartlett Yancy, 1821-1828," *North Carolina Historical Review,* VIII (October, 1931), 427-462.

Shanks, Henry T., *The Papers of Willie Person Mangum,* 5 vols. Raleigh: State Department of Archives and History, 1950-1956.

Wilson, Edwin M., *The Congressional Career of Nathaniel Macon Followed by Letters of Mr. Macon and Willie P. Mangum with Notes by Kemp P. Battle, The James Sprunt Historical Monographs,* II (Chapel Hill, 1900).

D Political Pamphlets

Clay, Henry, *An Address to the Public Containing Certain Testimony in Refutation of the Charges Against Him Made by General Jackson Touching the Last Presidential Election.* Washington: Peter Force, 1827.

Graham, James, *Circular of James Graham to the Citizens of the Twelfth Congressional District.* Rutherfordton: n.p. [1836].

Hall, Thomas H., *To the Qualified Voters of the Third Congressional District of North Carolina* [Washington] n.p., 1835.

Haywood, William H., Jr., *To the Freemen of Wake County.* [Raleigh] Philo White, January 14, 1835.

Hutchison, James M., *To the Freemen of Mecklenberg County.* [Charlotte] n.p., January 22, 1835.

Rencher, A[braham], *To the Freemen of the Tenth Congressional District of North Carolina.* Washington: n.p., March 6, 1835.

Williams, Lewis, *To the Citizens of the Thirteenth Congressional District of North Carolina.* Washington: n.p., February 21, 1827.

———, *To the Citizens of the Thirteenth Congressional District of North Carolina.* Washington: n.p., February 12, 1833.

———, *To the Citizens of the Thirteenth Congressional District of North Carolina.* Washington: n.p, February 18, 1835.

E Memoirs, Autobiographies, and Collected Documents

Adams, Charles Francis, *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams, Comprising Portions of His Diary from 1795 to 1848,* 12 vols. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott and Company, 1875.

Commager, Henry Steele, *Documents of American History.* New York: F. S. Crofts and Company, 1946.

Connor, Robert D. W., *Autobiography of Asa Biggs Including a Journal of a Trip from North Carolina to New York in 1832.* Raleigh: North Carolina Historical Commission, 1915.

Fitzpatrick, John C., *The Autobiography of Martin Van Buren* (Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1918, Vol. II). Washington: Government Printing Office, 1920.

F Newspapers (All are weekly papers except the Raleigh *Register.*)

All are at the University of North Carolina library unless the location is given.

Baltimore *Niles' Weekly Register,* 1824-1837.
Charlotte *Catawba Journal,* 1824-1828.
Charlotte *Miners and Farmers Journal,* 1830-1835.
Fayetteville *North Carolina Journal,* 1827-1832.
Fayetteville *Observer,* 1824-1836.
Greensboro *Patriot,* 1827-1836.
Halifax *Minerva,* 1829-1830. Department of Archives and History, Raleigh.
Hillsboro *Recorder,* 1824-1836.
New Bern *Spectator and Literary Journal,* 1828-1837.
Raleigh *North Carolina Standard,* 1834-1837. State Library, Raleigh.
Raleigh *Register and North Carolina Gazette,* 1824-1837. State Library, Duke Library, and University of North Carolina Library.
Raleigh *Star and North Carolina Gazette,* 1824-1836. State Library and University of North Carolina Library.
Salisbury *Carolina Watchman,* 1832-1837.
Salisbury *Western Carolinian,* 1824-1837.
Salisbury *Yadkin and Catawba Journal,* 1828-1833.
Tarboro *Free Press,* 1825-1837.
Warrenton *Reporter,* 1825-1827.

II SECONDARY SOURCES

A State Histories

Boyd, William K., *The Federal Period, 1783-1860* (Vol. II in Connor, R. D. W., Boyd, W. K., and Hamilton, J. G. deR., *History of North Carolina,* 3 vols. Chicago: Lewis Publishing Company, 1919.
Connor, Robert D. W., *North Carolina: Rebuilding an Ancient Commonwealth, 1584-1925,* 2 vols. Chicago: American Historical Society, Inc., 1929.
Henderson, Archibald, *North Carolina, The Old North State and the New,* 5 vols. Chicago: Lewis Publishing Company, 1941.
Lefler, Hugh T., *History of North Carolina,* 4 vols. New York: Lewis Publishing Company, 1956.
Lefler, Hugh T., and Newsome, Albert Ray, *North Carolina: The History of a Southern State.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1954.

B Monographs and Special Articles

Boyd, William K., "Currency and Banking in North Carolina, 1790-1836," Trinity College Historical Society *Historical Papers* (Durham) X (1914), 55-86.

———, "Federal Politics in North Carolina, 1824-1836," *South Atlantic Quarterly,* XVIII (January-April, 1919), 41-51, 167-174.

Brown, Cecil K., *A State Movement in Railroad Development: The Story of North Carolina's First Effort to Establish an East-West Trunk Line Railroad.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1928.

Daniel, Carolyn A., "The Early Career of David Lowry Swain." Unpublished master's thesis, University of North Carolina, 1947.

Eaton, Clement, "Southern Senators and the Right of Instruction, 1780-1860," *Journal of Southern History,* XVIII (August, 1952), 303-319.

Foster, William O., "The Life of Montfort Stokes." Unpublished master's thesis, University of North Carolina, 1939.

Gilpatrick, Delbert H., *Jeffersonian Democracy in North Carolina, 1789-1816.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1930.

Green, Fletcher M., *Constitutional Development in the South Atlantic States, 1776-1860: A Study in the Evolution of Democracy.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1930.

———, "Gold Mining: A Forgotten Industry of Ante-Bellum North Carolina," *North Carolina Historical Review,* XIV (January, April, 1937), 1-19, 135-155.

Hamilton, J. G. deRoulhac, *Party Politics in North Carolina, 1835-1860,* Volume XV of *The James Sprunt Historical Publications.* Raleigh: The North Carolina Historical Society, 1916.

Haywood, Marshall D., "John Branch, Secretary of the Navy in the Cabinet of President Jackson, Etc.," *The North Carolina Booklet,* XV (October, 1915), 49-103.

Henderson, Archibald, "Unable to Agree on Duel Weapons, Caldwell and Fisher Wrote It Out," in [J. G. deRoulhac] Hamilton, Collector, Scrapbook, 157. A collection of newspaper clippings in the University of North Carolina Library.

Hoffmann, William S., "Andrew Jackson, State Rightist: The Case of the Georgia Indians," *Tennessee Historical Quarterly,* XI (December, 1952), 329-345.

———, "Downfall of the Democrats: The Reaction of North Carolinians to Jacksonian Land Policy," *North Carolina Historical Review,* XXXIII (April, 1956), 166-180.

———, "Origins of the Jackson Party." Unpublished masters thesis. University of Wisconsin, 1950.

———, "The Election of 1836 in North Carolina," *North Carolina Historical Review,* XXXII (January, 1955), 31-51.

———, "The Split Between Andrew Jackson and John C. Calhoun." Unpublished honors essay, University of North Carolina, 1948.

———, "Willie P. Mangum and the Whig Revival of the Doctrine of Instructions," *Journal of Southern History,* XXII (August, 1956), 292-309.

Holder, Branton B., "The Three Banks of the State of North Carolina, 1810-1872." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1937.

James, Marquis, *Andrew Jackson: Portrait of a President.* Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1937.

Jones, Houston G., "Bedford Brown: State Rights Unionist," *North Carolina Historical Review,* XXXII (July, 1955), 321-345.

Klein, Philip S., *Pennsylvania Politics, 1817-1832: A Game Without Rules.* Philadelphia: Philip S. Klein, 1940.

McDuffie, Penelope, "Chapters in the Life of Willie P. Mangum," Trinity College Historical Society *Historical Papers* (Durham) XV (1925), 5-54.

Newsome, Albert R., *The Presidential Election of 1824 in North Carolina,* Volume XXIII, No. 1 in *The James Sprunt Studies in History and Political Science.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1939.

Norton, Clarence C., *The Democratic Party in Ante-Bellum North Carolina, 1835-1860,* Volume XXI in *The James Sprunt Historical Studies.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1930.

Parton, James, *Life of Andrew Jackson,* 3 vols. New York: Mason Brothers, 1861.

Pegg, Herbert D., "The Whig Party in North Carolina." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1932.

Sellers, Charles G., "Who Were the Southern Whigs?" *American Historical Review,* LIX (January, 1954), 335-346.

Stroupe, Henry S., "The Beginnings of Religious Journalism in North Carolina, 1823-1865," *North Carolina Historical Review,* XXX (January, 1953), 1-22.

Ward, John W., *Andrew Jackson: Symbol for an Age.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1955.

INDEX

abolition in District of Columbia, 109
Adams, John Quincy, 4, 7, 8, 10-12, 16-25
Alabama legislature, 35, 103
Alexander, Richard H., 77-78
Alexander, William J., 29-32, 49-51, 75, 77, 92, 95, 116
Alston, Willis, 7-8, 23, 28, 42, 49
"American system," 4, 21
Asheboro meeting, 55
Avery, Isaac T., 24

Baden County, 25
Badger, George, 19, 38
Bailey, John, 63-64
Baltimore convention, 47-51, 104
Bank of North Carolina, 69-70
Bank of State of North Carolina, 70, 119
Barbour, Philip P., 48-57, 115
Barringer, Daniel M., 13, 30, 43, 53, 67, 94
Battle of New Orleans, 1
Beard, John, 84
Beaufort County, 18, 25, 56, 82
Bell, Elijah, 84
Benton, Thomas Hart, 78, 91, 92, 98, 110
Bethune, Lauchlin, 43, 67, 93, 105-6
Biddle, Nicholas, 71, 80
billiard board purchase, 20
Bingham, Lemuel, 17, 20. *See* Charlotte *Catawba Journal and* Salisbury *Yadkin and Catawba Journal*
Blair, Francis P., 93-94
Blount, William A., 49
Bragg, John, 78, 92
Branch, Andrew Jackson, 38
Branch, John, supports Jackson, 3; denounces Crawford men, 6; attacks Adams, 10; warns Jackson, 11; supports Polk, 14; reelected senator, 26-27; appointed to cabinet, 30, 38-39; most prominent Jacksonian, 36; background, 37-38; reaction of state to his appointment, 39; conflict with Eaton, 39-41; action after dismissal, 41-46; elected to Congress, 42-43; in election of 1832, 47-57; candidate for governor, 59-60; praises Clay and Calhoun, 64-65; faces defeat, 66-67; in Senate race of 1834, 75; speech on instruction resolution, 79; constitutional convention, 84, 86-87; importance, 116; followers believe in state sovereignty, 118
Brown, Bedford, replaces Yancey, 14; elected speaker, 30; elected senator, 31; defends Van Buren, 44; election of 1832, 50-51; against recharter, 53; opposes force bill, 64; denounces nullifiers, 65; and national bank, 71, 75-77; reelected, 72-78, 80; "instructed" to support restoration of deposits, 74; land policy, 90, 101; preparedness, 99; in election of 1836, 108-110; resigns from Senate, 119
Brownrigg, James, 16
Brunswick County, 25
Brunswick Union meeting, 58
Bryan, James, 81, 86
Bryan, John H., 8, 13, 21, 30
Bryan, Joseph H., 51
Burke County grand jury, 82
Burke County resolutions, 74
burning of the capitol, 81
Burns, Ottway, 85
Burr, Aaron, 23
Burton, Hutchins G., 2, 6, 10, 11, 14
Bynum, Jesse, 28, 33-35, 42-43, 50, 67, 94, 99

Cabarrus County, 56
Caldwell, David, 29, 32, 34, 66, 116
Caldwell-Alexander-Owen faction, 29-35
Calhoun, John C., election of 1824, 3-5; tries to win Crawford men, 12; trip to see Yancey, 13; rumor to be dropped, 18-19; election of 1828, 20; break with Jackson, 40-41; causes Van Buren's rejection, 44; favored by Branch's group, 45; condemned, 58; compromise tariff, 65-66; held in contempt, 66; philosophy of followers, 68; "deposit bill," 99; denounced, 99-100; election of 1836, 103, 115; opposed by Jackson, 117; followers believe in state sovereignty, 118. *See also* nullification
Cameron, John, 29-30
Cape Fear Bank, 70
Carolina Watchman. *See* Salisbury *Carolina Watchman*
Carson, Samuel, 9, 13, 14, 20-22, 30, 31, 38, 40, 43, 45, 53, 56, 65, 66, 74, 79
Carteret County, 50
Caswell County, 3, 25
Catawba Journal, 8
Charlotte, 110
Charlotte *Catawba Journal*, 8

Charlotte *Miners and Farmers Journal,* 73, 74
Cherokee removal, 52, 106
Clay, Henry, election before House, 7; patronage, 11; election of 1828, 16, 20, 22; election of 1832, 49, 51, 54, 55; compromise tariff, 65; praised, 66-67; resolution of censure, 72; distribution, 74, 90, 91, 99; condemned, 99-100; considered as presidential candidate in election of 1836, 103; opposed by Eastern Carolinians, 116
Clingman, Thomas L., 96
Clinton, DeWitt, 12, 18, 108
"coffin bills," 22
Connor, Henry W., 7, 9, 13, 30, 43, 65, 67, 74, 94
Constitutionalist, 50, 64, 73
constitutional revision, 81-89
contested Congressional election, 106-107
Cooper, John, 86
Cotton, Richard, 94
Cradup, Josiah, 9, 94
Craig, Burton, 94
Craven County, 83
Crawford, William H., 4-5, 18, 19, 20, 115
Creek Indians, 10
Croom, Isaac, 51
Culpepper, John 7, 8, 13, 16
Cumberland County, 83

Daniel, Joseph John, 50, 87
Davidson, William, 16-18, 26
Davidson County, 56
Deberry, Edmund, 30, 43, 67, 93
Democrats. *See* distribution, elections, national bank, nullification
Devereaux, Thomas P., 16, 18
direct election of governor, 87-88
Dishongh, Lewis, 67, 94
distribution, 74, 90-100, 120
Donnell, John R., 28, 29, 31-34
Downing, Maj. Jack, 73
Dudley, Edward B., 43, 45, 49, 84, 105-7
Durham, Brennen H., 94

Eaton, John H., 19, 38-41, 44
Eaton, Margaret, 38, 39, 40, 43
Edenton *Gazette,* 82, 88
Edwards, Weldon N., 9, 11, 13, 53, 79, 87-88
elections, presidential, 3-5, 16-25, 47-57, 102-12; legislative, 5, 29-30, 59, 75, 95, 107-108; senatorial, 6, 26-28, 30-34, 74-78; special, 7; congressional, 8-9, 13-14, 29-30, 42-43, 66-67, 93-95; gubernatorial, 6, 14, 34, 59-60, 78, 95, 105-7; constitutional convention, 85, 89
expunging resolution, 78-80

Fair Deal, 121
Fayetteville, 19, 81, 106
Fayetteville *North Carolina Journal,* 42, 47, 50, 53, 54
Fayetteville *Observer,* 36, 45, 89, 97-98, 103. *See also* Hale, Edward
Federalist party, 2, 3. *See also* elections
Fisher, Charles, election of 1824, 3-5; supports Branch, 27; considered for Senate, 28; defeated for speaker, 30; in Senate race of 1829, 31; declines running, 32; elected speaker, 32; quoted, 35; joins Branch, 45; opposes Van Buren, 47, 56; denounced, 55; threatened duel, 66; free Negro voting, 87; election of 1836, 103; influence, 116
Fleming, Samuel, 79
Force bill, 64-65
Forsyth, John, 44-45, 74
France, 98-99
Franklin, Meshack, 7
Franklin County, 19
Freeman, Edward, 43. *See also* Halifax *Minerva*
free Negro voting, 86-87, 108-109

Gales, Joseph, 6, 14, 17, 18, 22, 85. *See also* Raleigh *Register*
Gales, Weston, 6, 82, 85, 104-5. *See also* Raleigh *Register*
Garrison, William Lloyd, 109
Gaston, William, considered for cabinet, 11; opposes Crawford, 18; receives letter concerning Jackson's birth, 24; quoted, 26; member of "independents," 29; Senate race of 1830, 76; suggested for president, 85, 103; in constitutional convention, 86-87
Gatlin, Alfred M., 7, 9
George III, 65
Giles, John, 9, 30, 49, 87
Globe, 50, 78
gold mining, 110
Gorrell, Ralph, 97
Graham, James, 1, 9, 66, 73, 79, 93, 94, 103, 106-7, 116
Graham, William A., 79, 95, 113, 116
Granville County, 25
Greensboro *Patriot,* 50
Guilford County, 25, 56
Gunn, Starling, 109
Gwinn, James W., 76, 78, 96

Hale, Edward J., 53, 54, 58. *See also* Fayetteville *Observer*
Halifax County, 56
Halifax meeting, 49
Halifax *Minerva,* 35, 45, 58. *See also* Freeman, Edward

Hall, Thomas, 9, 13, 30, 43, 63, 65, 67, 93, 101, 113
Hammond, Charles, 24
hard money, 110
Harrison, William Henry, 102, 106, 111, 112
Hartford Convention, 65
Hartley, Abner, 84
Hawkins, Micajah, 43, 67, 94
Haywood, William H., 35, 63, 69, 82, 83, 84, 92, 95, 112, 113, 119
Heartt, Dennis, 22, 25
Henderson, Leonard, 50
Henderson, Pleasant, 91-93
Henry, Louis, 35, 59
Hillman, Samuel, 29
Hillsboro *Recorder*, 25. *See also* Heartt, Dennis
Hines, Richard, 9, 13
Hinton, Charles L., 32-34
Hinton, Joseph, 73
Holmes, Gabriel, 8, 13, 30, 43
Holmes, Owen, 50, 51
Hooks, Charles, 9
Howard, George, 20, 25, 53, 88. *See also* Tarboro *Free Press*

"Independents," 29-35
instructions, 48, 62, 74, 78-80, 119-20
internal improvements, 34-35, 69. *See also* constitutional revision, distribution, elections
Iredell, James, 2, 14, 17, 27-28, 29, 32, 34, 45, 48-49, 54
Iredell County, 25, 56

Jack's Son (version of Jackson's birth), 24
Jackson, Andrew, New Orleans victory, 1; as portrayed by biographers, 1-2; election of 1824, 3-5; appreciates Branch, 10; accepted by "Old Republicans," 6-15; election of 1828, 16-25; Maysville veto, 35; resolution for reelection 35-36; quoted on cabinet change, 37; relations with Branch, 38-43; election of 1832, 45-57; Verplanck tariff, 63; anti-nullification proclamation, 63, 68; argues with Macon, 64; force bill, 65, 68; national bank, 70, 80; protest, 72; Senate race of 1834, 76, 78; expunging resolution, 79; veto of distribution bill, 90, 97; denounces France, 98; deposit bill, 99; toast on distribution, 100; constitutional interpretations, 68, 100, 117-18; significance of opposition to distribution, 100-1; fails to appoint Ruffin to cabinet, 103; popularity, 115, 117; opponents, 116; chief complaint of North Carolinians against, 120-21
Jackson, Rachel, 23
Jefferson, Thomas, 23, 115
Jennings, Fanny, 24
Johnson, Richard M., 43, 52, 102, 104, 109-10
Jones, Hamilton C., 76, 83. *See also* Salisbury *Carolina Watchman*
Jones, Joseph Seawell, 111
Jones County, 25
Jordon, Dillon, 84
Jordon, Henry, 97
Joyner, Andrew, 67

Kent, Joseph, 8
King, Samuel, 67, 92

land policy, 90-100. *See also* distribution
Lathan, Frederick P., 84
Lawrence, Alexander, 19-20. *See also* Raleigh *Star*
Lawrence, Joshua, 88
Leake, Walter F., 60
Lenoir, Gen. William, 24
Lewis, William B., 33, 34
Lincoln County grand jury, 82
Lockhart, William B., 85
Long, John W., 9, 13, 17, 30
Long, William L., 94
Love, Robert, 50

Macon, Nathaniel, leader of "Old Republicans," 3; reelected senator, 6; opposes Clay, 8; reaction to Adams' message, 10; against Panama Congress, 10; disgusted at "inferior station," 11; demands Yancey refuse post, 11; dislikes Adams and Jackson, 12; considered for vice-president, 19; resigns from Senate, 27; view on nullification, 64; letter on nullification, 66, 68; in constitutional convention, 85, 87-88; in election of 1836, 104
Madison, James, 108
Mangum, Priestley H., 72
Mangum, Willie P., election before the House, 7; reelected to Congress, 9; declares Crawford men to "stand aloof," 9; reaction to Adams' message, 10; urged to see Clay, 11; doubts Clinton can win, 12; reports Jackson to be "taken up," 12; prominent in "Spaight faction," 28; Senate race of 1830, 32-34; ambitions, 36; defends Van Buren, 44; accepted as ally by Branch group, 45; and national bank, 53; denounces nullification, 54; opposes anti-nullification proclamation and force bill, 64-65; deserts Jackson, 71-72; instructions, 74-80; French war scare, 98-99; opposes Calhoun's nomination, 103; mentioned

for president, 103; compared to Tyler, 104; suggested for governor, 105; speech on mint bill, 110; resigns, 112, 119
Manly, Charles, 49
Manly, Mathias, 84
Manney, James, 16, 22, 84
Marshall, John, 52
Martin, James, 60
Maysville veto, 35, 120
McCormick, Duncan, 85
McKay, James, 43, 67, 94
McLean, John, 39-40
McLeod, John, 82, 94
McNeil, David, 84
McNeill, Archibald, 8, 13
McQueen, Hugh, 79, 86
Meares, William B., 16, 29, 31, 35, 86, 95, 105
Mebane, James, 28, 51
Mhoon, James G., 42
Miller, William, 11
Miners and Farmers Journal, 73, 74
mint, 110
"Modern Republicanism," 121
Monk, Archibald, 61
Montgomery, William, 48, 52, 94
Montgomery County, 56
Moseley, William D., 35, 59, 77, 78, 83-84, 95, 112
Mouse Trying to Gnaw Out of Catholic Trap, 88
Murphey, Archibald D., 3, 13, 31
Muse, John, 112

Napoleon, 1
national bank, 52-53, 70-80, 118-119
National Republicans. *See* distribution, elections, national bank, nullification
New Bern meeting, 19
New Bern *North Carolina Sentinel*, 30, 50, 104
New Bern *Spectator*, 25, 26, 39, 47, 53, 62, 65, 82, 85, 86, 88, 103. *See also* Pasteur, John I.
New Deal, 101, 121
Newland, David, 66, 94, 106
North, Lord, 65
North Carolina Journal. *See* Fayetteville *North Carolina Journal*
North Carolina Sentinel, 30, 50, 104
North Carolina Standard. *See* Raleigh *North Carolina Standard*
North Carolinians, reaction to nullification, 56, 58, 66; to national bank fight, 70-74; to instructions, 80
nullification, 54-68

O'Brien, Spencer, 28
Old Ironsides, 22, 39
"Old Republicans," 3, 6-15, 50
Ousby, Thomas, 84
Outlaw, George, 7-8
Outlaw, George, 49, 91-92
Owen, John, 28, 29, 32-34, 43, 45, 49, 72, 75, 113
Oxford *Examiner*, 45, 48, 82, 105

Panama Congress, 10
Panic of 1837, 120
Pasteur, John I., 17, 63. *See also* New Bern *Spectator*
"patent right party," 26, 28
Pearson, Richmond M., 66, 94
Pennsylvania, 4
"People's party," 3-5
Person County, 25
Pettigrew, Ebenezer, 93
Pipkin, Isaac, 94
Pitt County, 25, 56
Polk, Thomas, 55, 59, 76, 105
Polk, William, 3, 11, 14, 19, 38-39, 45, 49
Potter, Robert, 29, 43
Potts, John, 61, 78

Quakers, 4, 17, 25

Raleigh *Constitutionalist*, 50, 64, 73
Raleigh *North Carolina Standard*, 73, 76, 78, 81, 87, 93, 95, 98, 99, 103, 104, 106, 110, 111. *See also* White, Philo
Raleigh *Register*, 8, 17, 20, 23, 62, 69, 70, 77, 83, 85, 89, 94-95, 98-99, 103, 110. *See also* Gales, Joseph *and* Gales, Weston
Raleigh *Star*, 8, 14, 18, 20, 24, 42, 44, 45, 54, 62, 63, 70, 85, 104. *See also* Lawrence, Alexander
Ramsey, Charles R., 50, 55, 59
Randolph County, 25
Rayner, Kenneth, 49
religious qualifications for office holding, 87-88
Rencher, Abraham, 30, 39, 43, 53, 65, 67, 92, 94
Rives, William C., 104
Robards, Lewis, 23
Rogers, William, 24
Roosevelt, Franklin D., 101
Rowan County, 55, 56, 66
Rowan County grand jury, 82
Ruffin, Thomas, 76, 103
Rush, Richard, 18

Salisbury *Carolina Watchman*, 54, 55, 70, 75, 83, 99, 103, 105. *See also* Jones, Hamilton C.
Salisbury *Western Carolinian*, 3, 8, 12, 22, 45, 49, 53, 54, 62, 65, 72-73, 78, 82, 85, 92, 103, 110
Salisbury *Yadkin and Catawba Journal*, 22, 39
Saunders, Romulus M., election before

House, 7-8; reelected to Congress, 9; wants Jackson under "honest cabinet," 12; banquet honoring, 13; new leader of "Old Republicans," 14; accuses Adams, 20; prominent in Spaight faction, 28-29; role in 1830 Senate race, 32-34; attacks Branch, 45; election of 1832, 48, 50-51, 57; establishes *Standard,* 73; constitutional revision, 82; elected judge, 95; tries to get cabinet post for Ruffin, 104; election of 1836, 104
Sawyer, Lemuel, 9, 13, 29
Sawyer, Samuel T., 59, 61
Seawell, Henry, 77, 84
Sergeant, John, 49, 51, 54
Settle, Thomas, 78
Shepard, William B., 13, 16, 29, 43, 53, 67, 94
Shepperd, Augustine H., 13, 30, 43, 67, 93, 106-7
"sheriff's bill," 94
Shipp, Bartlett, 94
Shober, Emmanuel, 87
Shocco Springs, 55
"Short, Dick," 73
six militiamen, 22-23
Smith, James S., 86, 88
Sneed, William, 32-34
Spaight, Richard Dobbs, defeated for Congress, 8-9; leader of "Old Republicans," 14; defeated for governor, 14, 28, 34, 59-60, 106; defeated for speaker, 26, 32; role in Senate race of 1830, 33-34; supports Bynum resolution, 34; defends resolution for Jackson's reelection, 35; in election of 1832, 50; introduces resolution, 61; sponsors referendum bill, 83; vote on convention, 85; elected governor, 95; opposes distribution, 96
"Spaight faction," 28-36, 47
Speight, Jesse, 26, 29, 30, 32, 34, 44, 45, 50, 64, 86-87, 94
spoliation claims, 98
Standard. See Raleigh *North Carolina Standard*
Stanley, John, 17
Star. See Raleigh *Star*
Statesman, 73
Statesville, 103
Steadman, William W., 28
Strange, Robert, 50, 76, 104, 112-13, 119
Stokes, Montfort, election of 1824, 4; defeated for governor, 6, 28; Senate race of 1828, 27; Senate race of 1829, 31; Senate race of 1830, 33; elected governor, 34; recommends Jackson's reelection, 35; defeated by Branch, 37; election of 1832, 50, 51; receives federal appointment, 59; plea for Union, 60
Swain, David L., mentioned for senator, 31; elected governor, 60; and internal improvements, 69; Senate race of 1834, 72, 74-78; asked to arrange for instructions, 74-75; reelected governor, 77-78; attacks administration, 78; opposes vote on amendments, 83; in constitutional convention, 85-87; and distribution, 91-92, 95; influence, 116

Tarboro *Free Press,* 22, 24, 69, 98. *See also* Howard, George
tariff, 4, 21-22, 48, 63, 65, 120. *See also* elections
Taylor, John, 19
Thompson, John B., 102
Timberlake, Margaret O'Neale, 38, 39, 40, 43
Toomer, John D., 61-62
Treaty of Ghent, 1
Turner, Daniel, 13, 29
Tyler, John, 104, 110

use of surplus revenue, 113

Van Buren, Martin, urges Yancey to remain uncommitted, 12; Southern tour, 12; leads Old Republicans, 15; considered for vice-president, 1828, 18-19; and Eaton affair, 40, 43; resigns, 40-41; rejected, 44; praised by Brown, 44; opposed by Branch faction, 45-58; urged to support Verplanck tariff, 63; free Negro voting, 87; land policy, 97, 101; election of 1836, 102-14; distribution, 120; mentioned, 115, 116
Vance, Robert, 7, 9, 13
Verplanck tariff, 63, 65
Virginia, 56

Walker tariff, 120
Ward, Edward, 33-34
Warren County, 25
Washington, George, 4, 23
Washington *Globe,* 50, 78
Washington (North Carolina) *Union,* 45
Watkins, Tobias, 24
Waugh, Harvey, 96, 98
Webster, Daniel, 16, 91, 99-100, 106, 116
Welborn, James, 26
Western Carolinian. See Salisbury *Western Carolinian*
"Western Republicans," 27
West Indian trade, 21
Whigs, 73. *See also* distribution, elections, national bank
whisky, 21
Whitaker, James, 62
White, Hugh Lawson, 85, 95, 101, 102-14

White, Philo, 23, 73, 77, 95, 99, 111. *See also* Raleigh *North Carolina Standard*
Wilkes County, 56
Wilkes County grand jury, 82
Williams, John, 13
Williams, Joseph, 42
Williams, Lewis, on objective of Jackson party, 1; reelected to Congress, 9, 13, 30, 43, 67, 93; wants to await reemergence of Crawford, 9; seeks post for friends, 11; Adams leader, 17, 18; and Jackson's birth, 24; decides against running for senator, 27; for recharter, 53; blames Van Buren for veto, 53; approves proclamation, 63; distribution, 90-92, 98; preparedness, 98; influence, 116
Williams, William P., 51
Williamson, John G. A., 67
Wilmington *Free Press*, 88-89
Wilson, Jesse, 27, 30
Wilson, Jesse, 86-88
Winslow, Warren, 49
Worcester vs. Georgia, 52

Yadkin and Catawba Journal, 22, 39
Yancey, Bartlett, 3, 6, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 37

THE JAMES SPRUNT STUDIES IN HISTORY AND POLITICAL SCIENCE

(Continued from inside front cover)

Vol. 19, No. 2. Studies in Hispanic-American History. Edited by William Whatley Pierson. Jr.

Vol. 20, No. 1. North Carolina Newspapers Before 1790. By Charles Christopher Crittenden.

Vol. 20, No. 2. The James A. Graham Papers, 1861-1884. Edited by Henry M. Wagstaff.

Vol. 21, Nos. 1 and 2. The Democratic Party in Ante-Bellum North Carolina, 1835-1861. By Clarence Clifford Norton.

Vol. 22, Nos. 1 and 2. Minutes of the North Carolina Manumission Society, 1816-1834. Edited by Henry M. Wagstaff.

Vol. 23, No. 1. The Presidential Election of 1824 in North Carolina. By Albert Ray Newsome.

Vol. 23, No. 2. The Secession Movement in North Carolina. By Joseph Carlyle Sitterson.

Vol. 24, No. 1. Jeffersonian Democracy in South Carolina. By John Harold Wolfe.

Vol. 24, No. 2. Guide to the Manuscripts in the Southern Historical Collection of the University of North Carolina.

Vol. 25, No. 1. North Carolina Boundary Disputes Involving Her Southern Line. By Marvin L. Skaggs.

Vol. 25, No. 2. Ante-Bellum South Carolina: A Social and Cultural History. By Rosser H. Taylor.

Vol. 26, No. 1. The Prohibition Movement in Alabama, 1702 to 1943. By James Benson Sellers.

Volume 27. Prohibition in North Carolina, 1715-1945. By Daniel Jay Whitener.

Volume 28. The Negro in Mississippi, 1865-1890. By Vernon Lane Wharton.

Volume 29. The Whig Party in Georgia, 1825-1853. By Paul Murray.

Volume 30. The South in Action: A Sectional Crusade Against Freight Rate Discrimination. By Robert A. Lively.

Volume 31. Essays in Southern History. Edited by Fletcher Melvin Green.

Volume 32. South Carolina Goes to War. By Charles Edward Cauthen.

Volume 33. Revolutionary Justice: A Study of the Organization, Personnel, and Procedure of the Paris Tribunal, 1793-1795. By James Logan Godfrey.

Volume 34. The Political Liberalism of the New York *Nation*, 1865-1932. By Alan Pendleton Grimes.

Volume 35. War Labor Boards in the Field. By Allan R. Richards.

Volume 36. The Raleigh Register, 1799-1863. By Robert Neal Elliott, Jr.

Volume 37. Constitutional Development in Alabama, 1798-1901: A Study in Politics, the Negro and Sectionalism. By Malcolm Cook McMillan.

Volume 38. Agricultural Developments in North Carolina, 1783-1860. By Cornelius Oliver Cathey.

Volume 39. Studies in Southern History. Edited by J. Carlyle Sitterson.

Volume 40. Andrew Jackson and North Carolina Politics. By William S. Hoffmann.